

---

---

# ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

IDEA Part B



FFY 2009 (2009 – 2010)

Submitted 2.1.2011

State of Iowa  
Iowa Department of Education  
Bureau of Student and Family Support Services  
Grimes State Office Building  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0146

---

---

## **IOWA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

Grimes State Office Building  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0146

### **State Board of Education**

Rosie Hussey, President, Clear Lake  
Charles C. Edwards, Jr., Vice President, Des Moines  
Sister Jude Fitzpatrick, West Des Moines  
Brian Gentry, Des Moines  
Michael L. Knedler, Council Bluffs  
Valorie Kruse, Sioux City  
Ana Lopez-Dawson, Pella  
Max Phillips, Woodward  
LaMetta Wynn, Clinton  
Corey Anderson, Student Member, Clive

### **Administration**

Jason Glass, Director and Executive Officer  
of the State Board of Education  
Gail M. Sullivan, Chief of Staff

### **Division of PK-12 Education**

Kevin Fangman, Division Administrator

### **Bureau of Student and Family Support Services**

Martin J. Ikeda, Chief  
Amy J. Williamson, Administrative Consultant  
Steve Crew, Administrative Consultant  
Frank Forcucci, Administrative Consultant

It is the policy of the Iowa Department of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, gender, disability, religion, age, political party affiliation, or actual or potential parental, family or marital status in its programs, activities, or employment practices as required by the Iowa Code sections 216.9 and 256.10(2), Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d and 2000e), the Equal Pay Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 206, *et seq.*), Title IX (Educational Amendments, **20 U.S.C. §§ 1681 – 1688**), Section 504 (Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. § 794), and the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12101, *et seq.*).

If you have questions or grievances related to compliance with this policy by the Iowa Department of Education, please contact the legal counsel for the Iowa Department of Education, Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines, IA 50319-0146, telephone number 515/281-5295, or the Director of the Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, 111 N. Canal Street, Suite 1053, Chicago, IL 60606-7204.

# Table of Contents

State of Iowa  
Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)

	Page
<b>Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE</b>	
Indicator 1: Graduation	1
Indicator 2: Dropout	10
Indicator 3: Participation and Performance	19
Indicator 4(A): Suspension and Expulsion	34
Indicator 4(B): Suspension and Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity	42
Indicator 5: Least Restrictive Environment 6-21	75
Indicator 6: Least Restrictive Environment 3-5	86
Indicator 7: Early Childhood Outcomes	87
Indicator 8: Parent Involvement	103
<b>Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality</b>	
Indicator 9: Disproportionality	120
Indicator 10: Disproportionality-Disability Category	145
<b>Monitoring Priority: General Supervision</b>	
Indicator 11: Child Find	146
Indicator 12: Transition C to B	154
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition – IEP	163
Indicator 14: Secondary Transition – One Year Out	180
Indicator 15: Monitoring	207
Indicator 16: Complaints	216
Indicator 17: Hearings	221
Indicator 18: Resolution Sessions	226
Indicator 19: Mediations	228
Indicator 20: Timely and Accurate Data	234

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

The SEA staff developed the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities, and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included the state Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), the Area Education Agencies (AEA) administration, the Iowa Department of Education staff, AEA High School Reform Consultants, and the Learning Supports Advisory Team.

Consistent with comments in the FFY 2008 (2008-2009) Response Table from OSEP, for Indicator 1, the SEA will report on progress or slippage on the required measurement, on improvement activities described in the State Performance Plan that were implemented in FFY 2009 (2009-2010), the outcomes of improvement activities implemented in FFY 2009 (2009-2010), and changes to improvement activities to be reported on for FFY 2010 (2010-2011).

The SEA will report to the public progress and/or slippage in meeting the “measurable and rigorous targets” found in the SPP/APR by posting on the State of Iowa Department of Education website ([http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592)) sometime after Feb 1, 2011 but no later than April 1, 2011, the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) APR submitted to OSEP. Any changes to the SPP accepted by OSEP will be posted within 30 days of receipt of the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) response letter to Iowa expected for receipt prior to July 1, 2011.

Performance of AEAs and LEAs on appropriate indicators will be posted by June 1, 2011. AEA profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590). District profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591). Iowa's Accountability Workbook is available at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308).

<b>Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE</b>
---

**Indicator 1:** Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

The following measurement for this indicator was a requirement of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) for both the six-year State Performance Plan and each Annual Performance Report. In addition, the following data source is required in the current Part B Measurement Table (OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 2/29/2012).

<b>Measurement:</b> States must report using the graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.
---

<b>Data Source:</b> Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).
---

The percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school is a performance indicator, and states must align the targets for this measure to the measurable objectives for all students and subgroups used in

the state's Accountability Workbook under the ESEA. After alignment, Iowa's targets for the remainder of this SPP range from 91.30% to 92.20%. Targets can be found in the section below titled: *Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)*.

Graduation in the State of Iowa is defined as (1) a student who has received a regular diploma who completed all unmodified district graduation requirements in the standard number of four years, or (2) students receiving a regular diploma from an alternative placement within the district, or who have had the requirements modified in accordance with a disability. Students who have finished the high school program but did not earn a diploma, or earned a certificate of attendance or other credential in lieu of a diploma are not considered graduates (Iowa NCLB Accountability Workbook).

The Title I cohort graduation rate will be calculated and reported beginning with the 2010-2011 school year, consistent with federal requirements. Currently the graduation rate in Iowa is calculated using the NGA four-year cohort rate. Because a unique student identifier was available statewide beginning in 2004-05, we are currently able to calculate a four-year cohort rate from FFY 2007 (2007-2008) forward. In FFY 2007, however, only four years of data were available, making it possible to calculate the four-year rate, but not to ensure that all freshmen (9<sup>th</sup>-graders) from four years prior were first-time freshmen. For FFY 2008 (2008-2009), the four-year cohort rate is calculated using five years of data that are queried to ensure that all freshmen included in the measurement are first-time freshmen. In order to measure improvement the four-year cohort rate is also calculated using only four years of data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008) and for FFY 2008 (2008-2009). The four-year rate using four years of data facilitates comparison in performance between the two time periods. Figure B1.1 presents state level four-year cohort data based on four and five years of data. The calculations are denoted as NGA 4 (four years of data) and NGA 5 (five years of data). Please note that both are four-year cohort rates: the 5 signifies that an additional year of data was queried for first-time freshmen status only.

The cohort rate that uses five years of data is calculated as the number of on-time graduates in 2008-09 divided by the number of first-time 9<sup>th</sup> graders in fall of 2004. Students who transfer in or out are excluded from the calculation, and students with IEPs are given additional time to graduate, per Iowa's NCLB accountability plan. The equation is shown below in Equation B1.1.

$$\left[ \frac{\text{n of on-time graduates in 2009}}{(\text{n of first-time 9th graders in fall 2005}) - (\text{n of students transferred out}) + (\text{n of students transferred in})} \right] * 100$$

**Equation B1.1 Iowa Four-Year Cohort Rate Using Five Years of Data FFY 2008 (2008-2009)**

The four-year cohort rate that relies on four years of data is calculated using the same equation, but the words "first-time" are eliminated. The equations used for the data presented below are shown in Equations B1.2 and B1.3.

$$\left[ \frac{\text{n of on-time graduates in 2009}}{(\text{n of 9th graders in fall 2005}) - (\text{n of students transferred out}) + (\text{n of students transferred in})} \right] * 100$$

**Equation B1.2 Iowa Four-Year Cohort Rate Using Four Years of Data FFY 2008 (2008-2009)**


$$\left[ \frac{\text{n of on-time graduates in 2008}}{(\text{n of 9th graders in fall 2004}) - (\text{n of students transferred out}) + (\text{n of students transferred in})} \right] * 100$$

**Equation B1.3 Iowa Four-Year Cohort Rate Using Four Years of Data FFY 2007 (2007-2008)**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2008</b> (2008-2009)	The percent of youth with IEPs graduating high school with a regular diploma will be greater than or equal to 91.30%.

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

Actual target data for Indicator B1 for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) are summarized in Figure B1.1.



**Figure B1.1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating high school with a regular diploma based on the NGA cohort rate using five years and four years of data.** Source. Iowa Department of Education Project EASIER, FFY 2007 (2007-2008) through FFY 2008 (2008-2009).

As depicted in Figure B1.1, Iowa did not meet the target for Indicator 1 for FFY 2008 (2008-2009)<sup>1</sup>. The actual data showed 79.55% of students with IEPs graduating high school with a regular diploma while the measurable and rigorous target was 91.30%. In order to determine if this represents progress or slippage from FFY 2007 (2007-2008) we use the comparison of the four-year cohort calculations using four years of data. Figure B1.1 shows slippage of 4.28% from the prior fiscal year using the comparable measure.

Table B1.1 provides numbers and percentages for each AEA and the State for: (a) Number of students with IEPs graduating with a regular high school diploma (b) Number of students in the cohort, (c) Number of students with IEPs transferring out of the cohort (d) Number of students with IEPs transferring into the

<sup>1</sup> Iowa is submitting data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009) in alignment with data submitted in the State Report Card for NCLB and the state's accountability workbook plan.

cohort, and (e) Percent of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma for FFY 2008 (2008-2009). Tables B1.2 and B1.3 provide similar numbers for the four-year cohort calculation using four years of data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008) and FFY 2008 (2008-2009). (Note: AEAs are the subrecipients of Part B funds in the state of Iowa and are considered Iowa's LEAs for the purposes of reporting in the SPP and APR, as per the State Eligibility Document.)

**Table B1.1**  
**Number and Percent of Students with IEPs Graduating with a Regular Diploma, by AEA**  
**Four-Year Cohort Rate using Five Years of Data FFY 2008 (2008-2009)**

AEA	1	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	State
(a) n of on-time graduates in 2009	382	613	346	352	492	1080	367	304	125	370	4431
(b) n of first-time 9th graders in fall 2005	513	1001	497	690	975	1752	540	535	188	634	7325
(c) n of students transferred out	76	211	104	161	345	407	123	152	30	146	1755
(d) n of students transferred in	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(e) Percent of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular high school diploma	87.41	77.59	88.04	66.54	78.10	80.30	88.01	79.37	79.11	75.82	79.55

Source. Iowa Department of Education Project EASIER, FFY 2008 (2008-2009).

**Table B1.2**  
**Number and Percent of Students with IEPs Graduating with a Regular Diploma, by AEA**  
**Four-Year Cohort Rate Using Four Years of Data FFY 2008 (2008-2009)**

AEA	1	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	State
(a) n of on-time graduates in 2009	385	618	350	353	498	1084	371	304	126	372	4461
(b) n of 9th graders in fall 2005	508	1011	501	660	970	1807	538	538	181	610	7324
(c) n of students transferred out	76	211	104	161	345	407	123	152	30	146	1755
(d) n of students transferred in	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(e) Percent of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular high school diploma	89.12	77.25	88.16	70.74	79.68	77.43	89.40	78.76	83.44	80.17	80.10


Source. Iowa Department of Education Project EASIER, FFY 2008 (2008-2009).

**Table B1.3**  
**Number and Percent of Students with IEPs Graduating with a Regular Diploma, by AEA**  
**Four-Year Cohort Rate Using Four Years of Data FFY 2007 (2007-2008)**

AEA	1	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	State
(a) n of on-time graduates in 2008	356	677	325	428	667	1108	379	309	111	441	4801
(b) n of 9th graders in fall 2004	474	968	445	655	977	1672	514	490	178	642	7015
(c) n of students transferred out	67	160	67	126	225	317	87	102	43	131	1325
(d) n of students transferred in	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(e) Percent of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular high school diploma	87.47	83.79	85.98	80.91	88.7	81.77	88.76	79.64	82.22	86.3	84.38

Source. Iowa Department of Education Project EASIER, FFY 2007 (2007-2008).

Figure B1.2 depicts performance for each AEA and the State of Iowa in FFY 2007 (2007-2008) and 2008 (2008-2009), against the FFY 2008 (2008-2009) target of 91.30%.



**Figure B1.2. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating high school with a regular diploma and percent of youth graduating high school with a regular diploma, by AEA.** Source. Iowa Department of Education Project EASIER, FFY 2007 (2007-2008), and FFY 2008 (2008-2009).

Figure B1.2 indicates that for FFY 2008 (2008-2009), no AEAs met the Measurable and Rigorous Target of 91.30%. Four-year cohort calculations based on comparable measures for FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 show that four of 10 AEAs made improvement from FFY 2007 (2007-2008) and FFY 2008 (2008-2009).



**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

*Discussion of Improvement Activities That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).* Meeting targets for each indicator in the SPP is a priority for Iowa, and resources have been committed to each indicator and across indicators, to impact actual target data for each FFY on which performance is reported.

Consistent with activities documented in the SPP, several improvement activities were implemented to impact meeting the targets for this indicator. While activities have not changed, the headings used to describe each activity were changed to match the Improvement Activity headings in the APR Checklists.

Improvement activities, Measureable Outcomes, and Status/Next Steps are summarized in Table B1.2.

**Table B1.2**  
**Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

<b>Improvement Activity</b>	<b>Measurable Outcomes</b>	<b>Status/Next Steps</b>
<b>Evaluation.</b> Data were verified within the Project EASIER system.	Improved accuracy of graduation data.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Evaluation.</b> Graduation data and related results (e.g., Compulsory Age Study) were analyzed across the following key stakeholders: Special Education Advisory Panel, SEA Staff, Iowa Collaboration for Youth Development, Iowa Rapidly Improving Schools Consultants, and the Learning Supports Advisory Team.	Stakeholders determined actions for 2010-2011 should include: (1) Work within the Learning Supports Implementation Teams (a team of 3 consultants in each AEA in the areas of Learning Supports, PBIS and Challenging Behavior) should continue in the areas of Supports for Instruction and Safe, Health, Caring Learning Environments; (2) The Iowa Rapidly Improving Schools should continue with results reported at the conclusion of 2010-2011 to determine the extent of continued resources/support; (3) Based on data, reviewed school communities should be identified based on established criteria, such as those with the lowest graduation rates across subgroups, to study, support and provide intense technical assistance as partners with the AEA using a strong; continuous improvement model (4) A cross-state agency resource directory and implementation manual should be developed to facilitate agency coordination and local community access to supports.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> The SEA continued to develop and provide technical assistance for LEAs to (a) appropriately use Iowa's reporting process, and (b) appropriately identify students at-risk of school failure and select appropriate interventions/strategies supported by appropriate resources.	(1) Alignment of identified student needs to appropriate practices is continuing through FFY 2010; (2) Provided direct technical assistance to each of Iowa's LEAs.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> The SEA restructured the Iowa High School Project as the Iowa Rapidly Improving Schools project. To this end, the SEA: (1) Developed criteria for selection of Rapidly Improving Schools;	(1) Criteria developed; (2) IRIS Schools identified; (3) 2-4 Regional trainings/onsite visits completed; results of Learning Criteria analyzed (4) Action Plans per participating school	Work will continue in IRIS. The following was completed in 2009-2010: (1) Criteria were developed as: a. Established Rigor/Relevance framework b. Established use of the Learning

<p>(2) Identified Iowa Rapidly Improving Schools (IRIS);</p> <p>(3) Provided direct technical assistance to participating schools that included training/support on Learning Supports; Iowa Core Curriculum; Rigor/Relevance; supportive programming for students with IEPs; the use of the Response to Intervention framework;</p> <p>(4) Implemented the use of the General Education Instructional Plan software.</p>		<p>Criteria</p> <p>c. Established culture of data review and use</p> <p>(2) Ten IRIS Schools that met criteria were identified</p> <p>(3) A total of seven Regional trainings and/or onsite visits that embedded Learning Supports, the Iowa Core Curriculum, Rigor/Relevance the RTI framework and supportive programming for students with IEPs were completed and resulted in</p> <p>a. Comprehensive visit reports for schools to use within school improvement efforts</p> <p>(4) An initial short term analysis of Learning Criteria across all ten sites indicated an increase in student achievement by June 2011</p>
<p><b>Provide technical assistance.</b></p> <p>A statewide Learning Supports network was established.</p> <p>(1) Learning Supports FTE secured at each AEA.</p> <p>(2) Developed Learning Supports Implementation Team at each AEA to increase capacity and sustainability.</p> <p>(3) Provided training for AEA teams.</p> <p>(4) Embedded Learning Supports into existing Department initiatives.</p>	<p>(1) Learning Supports FTE secured</p> <p>(2) Learning Supports Implementation Team in place</p> <p>(3) SEA and AEA Accountability system developed</p> <p>(4) Learning Supports framework/strategies embedded within other major DE initiatives</p>	<p>Work within the Learning Support Implementation Teams will continue. The following work was completed in 2009-2010:</p> <p>(1) Learning Supports FTE across each AEA was secured.</p> <p>(2) Learning Supports Implementation Team in each AEA was established. Each AEA team consisted of: Learning Supports Consultant, PBIS Coordinator and Challenging Behavior Specialist.</p> <p>(3) SEA and AEA Accountability system is currently being developed.</p> <p>(4) Learning Supports framework/strategies were embedded within the Iowa Core Curriculum, the Iowa Rapidly Improving Schools project, PBIS, Olweus, and the Challenging Behavior project.</p>
<p><b>Provide technical assistance.</b></p> <p>Completed the Compulsory Attendance Age study to obtain information on supports needed if the compulsory age is raised from 16 to 18:</p> <p>(1) Identify statewide workgroup</p> <p>(2) Research challenges/benefits from other states who have raised the compulsory age</p> <p>(3) Conduct statewide focus groups to determine supports needed</p> <p>(4) Data across (2) and (3) analyzed/summarized and provided to workgroup</p> <p>(5) Develop recommendations to state legislators</p>	<p>(1) Workgroup identified</p> <p>(2) State research completed</p> <p>(3) Literature review completed</p> <p>(4) Focus groups completed</p> <p>(5) Results analyzed and provided to workgroup</p> <p>(6) Recommendations provided to legislators</p>	<p>Work was completed in 2009-2010:</p> <p>(1) Workgroup members were identified and convened.</p> <p>(2) State research was completed.</p> <p>(3) Literature review was completed.</p> <p>(4) Focus groups were conducted .</p> <p>(5) Results were analyzed, developed into a report, and provided to the workgroup.</p> <p>(6) The workgroup provided recommendations; recommendations/report document was provided to legislators.</p>
<p><b>Provide technical assistance.</b></p> <p>Developed targeted cross-agency priorities to increase the graduation rate to 95% across subgroups (i.e., minority and students with disabilities):</p> <p>(1) The following stakeholders to agree on collaborative graduation goal and related measures: Iowa Collaboration for Youth Development (ICYD, cross state-agency team) and Learning Supports Advisory Team. (LSAT)</p>	<p>(1) Goal and measures developed</p> <p>(2) Action plan developed</p>	<p>(1) Goal and measures developed</p> <p>(2) Action Plan: Priorities identified; Individual agency roles identified for addressing the policies and strategies within each of the three priorities; Strategies implemented, with initial steps as identifying communities using established criteria, such as those with the lowest graduation rates across subgroups, to study, support and provide intense technical assistance as partners with the AEA</p>

(2) Three priority areas identified with policy and strategies associated with each		
<b>Improve systems administration and monitoring.</b> The SEA used graduation data in making annual AEA and LEA determinations.	All LEAs and AEAs were notified of determinations status. Three districts are being monitored for performance on graduation based on FFY 2007 data. The districts have developed a corrective action plan and are receiving technical assistance from the AEA and SEA.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)

*Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).* The analyses of FFY 2008 (2008-2009) data form the basis of discussion that follows.

For FFY 2008 (2008-2009), the Actual Target Data for the State of Iowa was 79.55%, while the Measurable and Rigorous Target for FFY 2008 (2008-2009) was 91.30%. Iowa did not meet the target and showed 4.28% slippage in the four-year cohort rate from Actual Target Data obtained in FFY 2007 (2007-2008). The SEA attributes slippage of the graduation rate for students with IEPs to (a) an equitable distribution of technical assistance, training and professional development at the indicator level across Iowa's AEAs and districts rather than targeted assistance to identified districts across indicators and other measures that indicate areas of chronic or intensive needs, (b) a dearth of school-based measures of conditions for learning that would lead to appropriate identification of systems, classroom and individual student needs, and (c) a variable application of continuous improvement processes at the district level that leads to omissions and/or inconsistencies in ongoing review of data, identification of needs/gaps based on data review, identification of interventions/solutions based on need, implementation of solutions and ongoing review of effects that would then result in needed revision. These areas of need are addressed in the Improvement Activities for indicators B1 and B2.

#### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010 (2010-2011):**

Proposed activities for FFY 2010 (2010-2011) are discussed in Table B1.3. Activities listed as ongoing in Table B1.2 will continue in FFY 2010 (2010-2011) and are not listed in Table B1.3.

**Table B1.3**  
**Improvement Activities Proposed for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**

<b>Proposed Activity</b>	<b>Proposed Personnel Resources</b>	<b>Proposed Timelines</b>	<b>Anticipated Outcomes</b>
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> Develop supports and targeted technical assistance to communities in most need: (1) Identify communities in most need as either (1) districts with the lowest graduation rates across subgroups, highest dropout rates across subgroups, and highest minority enrollments, or (2) schools/districts in need of assistance/persistently low-achieving schools. (2) Conduct community conversations in select sites to determine what supports are needed to reach a 95% graduation rate. (3) Based on results of conversations as well as results from survey of Conditions for Learning (referred to in B2) – develop/coordinate supports and targeted technical assistance with communities in most need.	Learning Supports Implementation Teams in each AEA 2 SEA Staff Iowa Collaboration for Youth Development	(1) and (2) by Fall 2010 (3) Winter 2011 through 2012	(1) Communities Identified (2) Conversations conducted; results to guide supports/direct technical assistance (3) 2011-supports coordinated and technical assistance provided in collaboration with AEA LSIT and state agencies; 2012 direct impact on graduation rates for students with IEPs
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> Develop cross-state agency resource directory and	Iowa Collaboration for Youth	FFY 2010	(1) Manual developed (2) Training developed and

Proposed Activity	Proposed Personnel Resources	Proposed Timelines	Anticipated Outcomes
implementation manual to facilitate agency coordination and local community access to supports.	Development 2 SEA Staff		delivered (3) Increased awareness and access to supports for students and families
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> Engage national/local experts in the areas of Supports for Instruction; Safe, Healthy, and Caring Learning Environments and Youth Engagement for the purpose of identifying (a) Key indicators and thresholds, (b) Effective practices that match needs.	National/local experts 2 SEA Staff Learning Supports Advisory Team	January 2011 and ongoing	(1) Key indicators established (2) Thresholds established (3) Practices identified

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

The SEA staff developed the Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) by reviewing baseline data, proposed targets, and improvement activities, and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included the state Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), the Area Education Agencies (AEA) administration, the Iowa Department of Education staff, Learning Supports Coordinators at the AEAs, and the Learning Supports Advisory Team.

Consistent with comments in the FFY 2008 (2008-2009) Response Table from OSEP, for Indicator 2, the SEA will report on progress or slippage on the required measurement, on improvement activities described in the State Performance Plan that were implemented in FFY 2009 (2009-2010), the outcomes of improvement activities implemented in FFY 2009 (2009-2010), and changes to improvement activities to be reported on for FFY 2010 (2010-2011).

The SEA will report to the public progress and/or slippage in meeting the “measurable and rigorous targets” found in the SPP/APR by posting on the State of Iowa Department of Education website ([http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592)) sometime after Feb 1, 2011 but no later than April 1, 2011, the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) APR submitted to OSEP. Any changes to the SPP accepted by OSEP will be posted within 30 days of receipt of the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) response letter to Iowa expected for receipt prior to July 1, 2011.

Performance of AEAs and LEAs on appropriate indicators will be posted by June 1, 2011. AEA profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590). District profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591). Iowa’s Accountability Workbook is available at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308).

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 2:** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

The following measurement for this indicator was a requirement of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) for both the six-year State Performance Plan and each Annual Performance Report. In addition, the following data source is required in the current Part B Measurement Table (OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 2/29/2012).

**Measurement:** States must report using the dropout data used in the ESEA graduation rate calculation and follow the timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

**Data Source:** Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2008</b> (2008-2009)	The percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school will be less than or equal to 14.08%.

The percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high is a performance indicator. Therefore, each state is allowed by OSEP to set their own target from baseline data. Iowa reset targets for the FFY 2008 (2008-2009) APR because the measurement of Indicator B2 changed. The SEA, with input from stakeholder groups, established measurable rigorous targets ranging from 14.08% to 11.73% for the remainder of the six-year State Performance Plan. Proposed targets can be found in the section below titled: *Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)*.

Iowa's process for determining which students count as dropouts has not changed. The measurement and targets we use for this indicator have changed, therefore we are submitting this indicator summary with a new measurement aligned with Iowa's reporting under the ESEA and proposed targets.

Students who satisfy one or more of the following conditions are considered dropouts:

1. Was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year and was not enrolled by October 1 of the current school year; or
2. Was not enrolled by October 1 of the previous school year although was expected to be enrolled sometime during the previous school year (*i.e.*, not reported as a dropout the year before; and
3. Has not graduated from high school or completed a State or district-approved educational program; and
4. Does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:
  - a) Transfer to another public school district, private school, or State or district-approved educational program,
  - b) Temporary school-recognized absence due to suspension or illness,
  - c) Death
  - d) Moved out of the State or Country.

A student who left the regular program to attend an adult program designed to earn a General Educational Development (GED) or an adult high school diploma administered by a community college is considered a dropout. A student who enrolls in an alternative school administered by a public school district is not considered a dropout.

The dropout rate is calculated using the same data used in the four-year National Governor's Association (NGA) cohort graduation rate for Indicator B1. The resulting calculation is a four-year dropout cohort rate, measure as shown in equation B2.1 below. As with Indicator B1, there are three rates calculated for Indicator B2: a four-year rate for FFY 2008 (2008-2009) using five years of data that can be queried to determine the appropriate cohort of first-time 9<sup>th</sup>-graders; a four-year rate for FFY 2008 (2008-2009) using four-years of data; and a four year rate for FFY 2007 (2007-2008) using four years of data. Iowa did not have five years of individually identifiable data until FFY 2008, making it impossible to identify first-time 9<sup>th</sup> graders in previous cohort calculations. While five years of data are used in calculating the four-year rate that is used to determine whether the target is met for this indicator (Equation B2.1), two four-year rates using four years of data are also calculated in order to facilitate comparison between years (Equations B2.2 and B2.3).

$$\left[ \frac{\text{n of dropouts in 2009}}{(\text{n of first-time 9th graders in fall 2005}) - (\text{n of students transferred out}) + (\text{n of students transferred in})} \right] * 100$$

**Equation B2.1 Four-Year Cohort Dropout Rate Using Five Years of Data FFY 2008 (2008-2009)**


$$\left[ \frac{\text{n of dropouts in 2009}}{(\text{n of 9th graders in fall 2005}) - (\text{n of students transferred out}) + (\text{n of students transferred in})} \right] * 100$$

**Equation B2.2 Four-Year Cohort Dropout Rate Using Four Years of Data FFY 2008 (2008-2009)**

$$\left[ \frac{\text{n of dropouts in 2008}}{(\text{n of 9th graders in fall 2004}) - (\text{n of students transferred out}) + (\text{n of students transferred in})} \right] * 100$$

**Equation B2.3 Three-Year Cohort Dropout Rate Using Four Years of Data FFY 2007 (2007-2008)****Actual Target Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

Actual target data for Indicator B2 for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) are summarized in Figure B1.1.



**Figure B2.1. State Percent of Students with IEPs Dropping Out.** Source. Iowa Department of Education Project EASIER Tables, FFY 2007 (2007-2008) through FFY 2008 (2008-2009) Note. Target range is less than or equal to target value.

For FFY 2008 (2008-2009), the four-year dropout rate based on five years of data was 20.45%.<sup>2</sup> The four-year dropout rate based on four years of data increased from 15.25% in FFY 2007 (2007-2008) to 19.90% in FFY 2008 (2008-2009).

<sup>2</sup> Iowa is submitting data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009) in alignment with data submitted in the State Report Card for NCLB and the state's accountability workbook plan.

Table B2.1 provides dropout data calculated for each Area Education Agency (AEA) and the State. (Note: AEAs are the subrecipients of Part B funds in the state of Iowa and are considered Iowa's LEAs for the purposes of reporting in the SPP and APR, as per the State Eligibility Document).

Data in table B2.1 represent: (a) the number of students with IEPs dropping out, (b) the number of students with IEPs in the cohort, (c) the number of students with IEPs transferring out, (d) the number students with IEPs transferring in, (e) the percent of students with IEPs dropping out.

**Table B2.1**  
**Number and Percent of Students with IEPs Dropping Out, by AEA**  
**Four-Year Cohort Rate Using Five Years of Data FFY 2008 (2008-2009)**

AEA	1	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	State
(a) n of dropouts in 2009	55	177	47	177	138	265	50	79	33	118	1139
(b) n of first-time 9th graders in fall 2005	513	1001	497	690	975	1752	540	535	188	634	7325
(c) n of students transferred out	76	211	104	161	345	407	123	152	30	146	1755
(d) n of students transferred in	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(e) Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out	12.59	22.41	11.96	33.46	21.90	19.70	11.99	20.63	20.89	24.18	20.45

Source. Iowa Department of Education Project EASIER Tables, FFY 2008 (2008-2009).

**Table B2.2**  
**Number and Percent of Students with IEPs Dropping Out, by AEA**  
**Four-Year Cohort Rate Using Four Years of Data FFY 2008 (2008-2009)**

AEA	1	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	State
(a) n of dropouts in 2009	47	182	47	146	127	316	44	82	25	92	1108
(b) n of 9th graders in fall 2005	508	1011	501	660	970	1807	538	538	181	610	7324
(c) n of students transferred out	76	211	104	161	345	407	123	152	30	146	1755
(d) n of students transferred in	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(e) Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out	10.88	22.75	11.84	29.26	20.32	22.57	10.60	21.24	16.56	19.83	19.90

Source. Iowa Department of Education Project EASIER Tables, FFY 2008 (2008-2009).




**Table B2.3**  
**Number and Percent of Students with IEPs Dropping Out, by AEA**  
**Four-Year Cohort Rate Using Four Years of Data FFY 2007 (2007-2008)**

AEA	1	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	State
(a) n of dropouts in 2008	50	128	52	98	85	239	47	79	23	67	868
(b) n of 9th graders in fall 2004	474	968	445	655	977	1672	514	490	178	642	7015
(c) n of students transferred out	67	160	67	126	225	317	87	102	43	131	1325
(d) n of students transferred in	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(e) Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out	12.29	15.84	13.76	18.53	11.3	17.64	11.01	20.36	17.04	13.11	15.25

Source. Iowa Department of Education Project EASIER Tables, FFY 2007 (2007-2008).

Figure B2.2 shows the percent of students with IEPs dropping out for FFY 2007 (2007-2008) and FFY 2008 (2008-2009) for each Area Education Agency (AEA) and the State.



**Figure B2.2. Percent of Students with IEPs Dropping Out Across AEsAs and the State, FFY 2007 (2007-2008) and FFY 2008 (2008-2009).** Source. Iowa Department of Education Project EASIER Tables, FFY 2007 (2007-2008).

Table B2.1 and Figure B2.2 indicate that the percent of students with IEPs dropping out ranged from a low of 11.96% to a high of 33.46% among the state's AEsAs. Three of ten AEsAs met the target, and four of ten AEsAs showed improvement from FFY 2007 (2007-2008) data.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):**

*Discussion of Improvement Activities That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).* Meeting targets for each indicator in the SPP is a priority for Iowa, and resources have been committed to each indicator and across indicators, to impact actual target data for each FFY on which performance is reported.

Consistent with activities documented in the SPP, several improvement activities were implemented to impact meeting the targets for this indicator. While activities have not changed, the headings used to describe each activity were changed to match the Improvement Activity headings in the APR Checklists.

Improvement activities, Measureable Outcomes, and Status/Next Steps are summarized in Table B2.4.

**Table B2.4**  
**Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

<b>Improvement Activity</b>	<b>Measurable Outcomes</b>	<b>Status/Next Steps</b>
<b>Evaluation.</b> Data were verified within the Project EASIER system.	Improved accuracy of dropout data.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Improve systems administration and monitoring.</b>  Dropout data, results of community conversations and compulsory age focus groups, and Learning Supports data across 6 result areas were analyzed with the following key stakeholders: SEA Staff, Iowa Collaboration for Youth Development, and the Learning Supports Advisory Team.	Stakeholders determined that the Learning Supports Advisory Team should continue as an active team to provide critical input/direction to Learning Supports, and the indicators of Graduation, Dropout and Suspension/Expulsion. Further, interventions/work should focus on schools in most need of assistance within a strong continuous improvement model.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Improve systems administration and monitoring.</b> The Learning Supports Advisory Team was convened bi-monthly to investigate additional initiatives/technical assistance/programs to support all children/youth and prevent them from dropping out of school.	Bi-annual meetings were convened; meeting results were analyzed and reported back to LSAT to improve process, function and products; state data were analyzed; the following were specific recommendations from LSAT: (1) Learning Supports should continue to be supported within the AEAs through FTE, and the Learning Supports Implementation Teams at each AEA (Teams of 3 consultants in Learning Supports, PBIS and Challenging Behaviors) should continue; (2) Learning Supports should continue to be embedded into existing programs/initiatives at the Department. (3) Learning Supports Advisory Team should continue with an active role in determining #4 below. (4) To impact the culture/climate of schools and support the skills necessary to remain in school, the SEA should develop/establish (a) Culture/climate standards, (b) social/emotional learning Core Curriculum, and (c) measures for Conditions for Learning to provide data for schools to make critical decisions, and follow impact/progress over time.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
Engage in three broad goals with related activities to develop/sustain Learning Supports:	(1) Infrastructure established and maintained for sustainability (2) Learning Supports Self-Study Guide	(1) Ongoing through FFY 2010 (a is completed) (2) Ongoing through FFY 2010 (a is

<p>(1) Establish infrastructure to support the Mission and Vision of state-wide Learning Supports – Develop, pilot, revise and implement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Standardized data reporting tools across audience, use and message type;</li> <li>b. A comprehensive list of programs/strategies within Core/Universal, Supplemental/Secondary and Intensive/Tertiary and across the 6 content areas of Learning Supports;</li> <li>c. An online tool to access (b)</li> <li>d. Content and Connections with the Iowa Core Curriculum</li> </ul> <p>(2) Establish tools to guide implementation of state-wide Learning Supports – Develop, pilot, revise and implement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Systems of Learning Supports Self-Study Guide which includes the Learning Supports Implementation Checklist as recommended by stakeholders</li> <li>b. Systems of Learning Supports Implementation Guide which includes the recommended products from stakeholder input (e.g., Cohesive Intervention Framework, Alignment Document, etc.)</li> </ul> <p>(3) Establish communication plan for state-wide Learning Supports – Develop, pilot, revise and implement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Standardized communication tools</li> <li>b. Case for change and awareness of Learning Supports</li> <li>c. Annual Conference structure and format</li> <li>d. Website for the general public</li> <li>e. Wiki for state-led Learning Supports development/collaborations</li> </ul>	<p>(3) and Implementation Guide Standardized communication plan established</p>	<p>completed)</p> <p>(3) Ongoing through FFY 2010 (a, b, c, d, and e are completed)</p>
<p>Develop Component Recovery content units aligned with the Iowa Core Curriculum to provide students options to complete unit credits by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Developing content units</li> <li>(2) Reviewing content units for Iowa Core alignment and best practices</li> <li>(3) Posting units on content website for statewide access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) At least 20 content units developed</li> <li>(2) Units reviewed and revised</li> <li>(3) Units posted on website for statewide access</li> </ul>	<p>Units are completed and posted; the SEA provided the foundation for unit development. Currently units are being developed across the state for review and posting. Unit development/posting will be ongoing outside of the SEA.</p>
<p>Develop a statewide Learning Supports network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Learning Supports FTE secured at each AEA</li> <li>(2) Develop Learning Supports Implementation Team (LSIT) at each AEA to increase capacity and sustainability (FTE for Learning Supports, Positive Behavioral Supports and Challenging Behaviors secured at each AEA).</li> <li>(3) Provide training for AEA teams</li> <li>(4) Embed Learning Supports into</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Learning Supports FTE secured</li> <li>(2) Learning Supports Implementation Team in place</li> <li>(3) SEA and AEA Accountability system developed</li> <li>(4) Learning Supports framework/strategies embedded within other major DE initiatives</li> <li>(5) Skill-building workshops provided; workshop evaluations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Learning Supports FTE has been secured</li> <li>(2) Learning Supports Implementation Team is in place</li> <li>(3) SEA and AEA accountability system is in development through FFY 2010</li> <li>(4) Learning Supports framework/strategies were embedded within the Iowa Core Curriculum, the Iowa Rapidly Improving Schools project, PBIS, Olweus, and the Challenging</li> </ul>

existing Department initiatives (e.g., Schools In Need of Assistance; Iowa Core Curriculum; School Improvement) (5) Skill-building workshops provided to network focused on mental health wraparound, PBIS, challenging behavior, transition, parent engagement and community partnerships		Behavior project – work at embedding across further state initiatives is ongoing (5) 6 workshop dates were provided in 2009-2010 focused on mental health wraparound, PBIS, challenging behavior, transition, parent engagement and community partnerships; between 100-400 attendees from across the state attended each workshop series.
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> The SEA used dropout data in making annual AEA and LEA determinations during FFY 2007 (2007-2008).	All LEAs and AEAs were notified of determinations status. One district is being monitored for performance on dropout based on FFY 2006 data. The district has developed a corrective action plan and is receiving technical assistance from the AEA and SEA.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)

*Discussion of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).* Iowa did not meet the target for Indicator B2 for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) based on FFY 2008 (2008-2009) data. Actual data showed 20.45% of students with IEPs dropping out, while the target was 14.08%. Data calculated to be comparable between FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 show that the state also showed slippage from 15.25% dropping out in FFY 2007 to 19.90% in FFY 2008 data. The SEA attributes this slippage to (a) an equitable distribution of technical assistance, training and professional development at the indicator level across Iowa's AEAs and districts rather than targeted assistance to identified districts across indicators and other measures that indicate areas of chronic or intensive needs, (b) a dearth of school-based measures of conditions for learning that would lead to appropriate identification of systems, classroom and individual student needs, and (c) a variable application of continuous improvement processes at the district level that leads to omissions and/or inconsistencies in ongoing review of data, identification of needs/gaps based on data review, identification of interventions/solutions based on need, implementation of solutions and ongoing review of effects that would then result in needed revision. These areas of need are addressed in the Improvement Activities for indicators B1 and B2.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010 (2010-2011):**

Proposed activities for FFY 2010 (2010-2011) are discussed in Table B2.5. These activities are consistent with what was proposed in the FFY 2004 (2004-2011) State Performance Plan and describe activities to be implemented in FFY 2010 (2010-2011) that will allow Iowa to meet measureable and rigorous targets for both FFY 2010 (2010-2011) and the targets continuing in the SPP through FFY 2012 (2012-2013).

(Note: Activities listed as ongoing in Table B2.4 will continue in FFY 2010 (2010-2011), and are not listed in Table B2.5).

**Table B2.5**  
**Proposed Activities for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**

Proposed Activity	Proposed Personnel Resources	Proposed Timelines	Anticipated Outcomes
Learning Supports workshops days coordinated across several SEA staff will be provided across six days of training, focused on mental health wraparound, PBIS, challenging behavior, autism, transition, supports for instruction, parent engagement and community partnerships.	9 SEA Staff	FFY 2010	Increased skills in specific areas, such as MH Wraparound, PBIS secondary and tertiary supports, social skills, parent and community engagement techniques and supports for instruction
Develop a strong continuous improvement model using existing SEA models: Instructional Decision-Making (IDM) and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports across the six Learning	6 SEA staff	FFY 2010-2011	Model developed and used within select schools in most need of assistance

Proposed Activity	Proposed Personnel Resources	Proposed Timelines	Anticipated Outcomes
Supports content areas			
<p>The following will be developed:</p> <p>(1) Measures for Conditions for Learning to provide data for schools to make critical decisions, and follow impact/progress over time,</p> <p>(2) Culture/climate standards,</p> <p>(3) Social/emotional learning Core Curriculum.</p>	<p>2 SEA Staff</p> <p>Outside agency/expert personnel</p>	<p>FFY 2010-2014</p>	<p>(1) Established reliable/valid measures of Conditions for Learning used at the individual student, school, LEA, AEA and SEA level</p> <p>(2) Standards established</p> <p>(3) Social/emotional learning Core Curriculum developed linked to standards and measures of Conditions for Learning</p>

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

The Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) was developed by State Education Agency (SEA) staff reviewing (a) trend data, (b) targets, and (c) improvement activities, and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these components (a) through (c), and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included the State of Iowa Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Area Education Agency (AEA) administration, and staff of the State Education Agency (SEA).

Consistent with comments in the FFY 2008 (2008-2009) Response Table from OSEP, for Indicator 1, the SEA will report on progress or slippage on the required measurement, on improvement activities described in the State Performance Plan that were implemented in FFY 2009 (2009-2010), the outcomes of improvement activities implemented in FFY 2009 (2009-2010), and changes to improvement activities to be reported on for FFY 2010 (2010-2011).

The SEA will report to the public progress and/or slippage in meeting the “measurable and rigorous targets” found in the SPP/APR by posting on the State of Iowa Department of Education website ([http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592)) sometime after Feb 1, 2011 but no later than April 1, 2011, the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) APR submitted to OSEP. Any changes to the SPP accepted by OSEP will be posted within 30 days of receipt of the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) response letter to Iowa expected for receipt prior to July 1, 2011.

Performance of AEAs and LEAs on appropriate indicators will be posted by June 1, 2011. AEA profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590). District profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591). Iowa’s Accountability Workbook is available at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308).

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 3:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

The following measurement for this indicator was a requirement of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) for both the six year State Performance Plan and each Annual Performance Report.

**Measurement:**

- A. AYP percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size)] times 100.
- B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in the assessment)

divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

C. Proficiency rate percent =  $\left( \frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient)}}{\text{(total \# of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math)}} \right)$ .

### Measurable and Rigorous Target:


Indicator B3A is a performance indicator for which states were allowed to set their own targets with the input of stakeholders. Indicators B3B and B3C are performance indicators for which the targets are aligned to the Annual Measureable Objectives for all students that are found in Iowa's Accountability Workbook for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Targets for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) are summarized in the table below.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target																								
2009 (2009-2010)	A. 63% percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size will meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup.																								
	B. 95% percent of students with IEPs will participate in the regular statewide assessment with no accommodations, the regular assessment with accommodations, the alternate assessment against grade level standards, or the alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.																								
	C. For each of the following grade level and content areas, targets for the percent of students proficient will be greater than or equal to:																								
	<table><tr><td>Grade</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>11</td></tr><tr><td>Reading</td><td>74.10%</td><td>76.00%</td><td>76.40%</td><td>69.70%</td><td>71.50%</td><td>73.30%</td><td>79.30%</td></tr><tr><td>Math</td><td>73.90%</td><td>74.70%</td><td>76.60%</td><td>72.80%</td><td>72.00%</td><td>72.00%</td><td>79.30%</td></tr></table>	Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	11	Reading	74.10%	76.00%	76.40%	69.70%	71.50%	73.30%	79.30%	Math	73.90%	74.70%	76.60%	72.80%	72.00%	72.00%	79.30%
	Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	11																	
Reading	74.10%	76.00%	76.40%	69.70%	71.50%	73.30%	79.30%																		
Math	73.90%	74.70%	76.60%	72.80%	72.00%	72.00%	79.30%																		
Note: These targets are aligned to Iowa's approved targets for all students under the ESEA.																									

### Actual Target Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):

The first measurement (A) of Indicator 3 is the percent of districts meeting AYP for the subgroup of students with disabilities (SWD).

Data summarizing number of districts in Iowa meeting minimum cell size requirements, and the number of those districts meeting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading and math, are summarized in Figure B3.1 and in Table B3.1.



**Figure B3.1. Percent of Districts with Minimum N that Met Adequate Yearly Progress, FFY 2007 (2007-2008) through FFY 2009 (FFY 2009-2010), Against State Target.** Source. Iowa Department of Education AYP Database, FFY 2007 (2007-2008) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

**Table B3.1**  
Districts Meeting AYP in Reading and Math for Students with Disabilities

Districts Meeting AYP for SWD	Met AYP for SWD Reading	Met AYP for SWD Math	Met AYP for SWD Reading and Math
22 districts met N of 30 in grade spans 3-5, 6-8, and 11	10 of 22 districts 45.45%	11 of 22 districts 50.00%	5 of 22 districts 22.73%


Source. Iowa Department of Education AYP Database, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

The State did not meet the target of 63.00% for Indicator B3A with 22.73% of districts meeting AYP.

The second measurement (B) of Indicator 3 is the participation of students with disabilities in statewide assessments of reading and math. Participation is defined as: (a) participating in regular assessment with no accommodations; (b) participating in regular assessment with accommodations; (c) participating in alternate assessment against grade level standards; or (d) participating in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.

Data on participation in statewide reading assessments are summarized in Figure B3.2 and in Table B3.2. Data on participation in statewide math assessments are summarized in Figure B3.3 and Table B3.3. Please note that a total percentage for participation in grades 3-8 and 11, inclusive, for math and for reading is included in each table, but Iowa does not report on targets for these totals. Iowa set targets for each grade level and subject in the state's accountability workbook for ESEA, and those targets are reported here.






**Figure B3.2 Participation Rate in Reading, FFY 2008 (2008-2009) through FFY 2009 (FFY 2009-2010), Against State Target.**  
 Source. Iowa Department of Education AYP Database, FFY 2008 (2008-2009) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

**Table B3.2**  
**FFY 2009 (2009-2010) Participation Rates in Statewide Assessments: Reading**

	3	4	5	6	7	8	11	Total
(a) # of children with IEPs in assessed grades	4332	4744	5021	4941	5069	4987	4645	33739
(b) # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100)	821 18.95%	721 15.20%	680 13.54%	533 10.79%	514 10.14%	462 9.26%	606 13.05%	4337 12.85%
(c) # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = [(c) divided by (a)] times 100)	3185 73.52%	3699 77.97%	4026 80.18%	4130 83.59%	4255 83.94%	4216 84.54%	3686 79.35%	27197 80.61%
(d) # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = [(d) divided by (a)] times 100)	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*
(e) # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = [(e) divided by (a)] times 100)	279 6.44%	295 6.22%	285 5.68%	261 5.28%	273 5.39%	277 5.55%	269 5.79%	1939 5.75%
(f) Children included in "a" but not included in "b", "c", "d", or "e" above	47	29	30	17	27	32	84	266
(g) Overall Participation Rate = [(b+c+d+e)/a]	4285 98.92%	4715 99.39%	4991 99.40%	4924 99.66%	5042 99.47%	4955 99.36%	4561 98.19%	33473 99.21%

Source. Information Management System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010); Iowa Department of Education AYP Database, FFY 2009 (2009-2010). \* Indicates that Iowa's assessment is currently in development.



**Figure B3.3 Participation Rate in Math, FFY 2008 (2008-2009) through FFY 2009 (FFY 2009-2010), Against State Target.**  
 Source. Iowa Department of Education AYP Database, FFY 2008 (2008-2009) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

**Table B3.3**  
**FFY 2009 (2009-2010) Participation Rates in Statewide Assessments: Mathematics**


	3	4	5	6	7	8	11	Total
(a) # of children with IEPs in assessed grades	4312	4746	5010	4941	5055	4985	4648	33697
(b) # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100)	825 19.13%	718 15.13%	679 13.55%	536 10.85%	513 10.15%	463 9.29%	612 13.17%	4346 12.90%
(c) # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = [(c) divided by (a)] times 100)	3180 73.75%	3698 77.92%	4009 80.02%	4125 83.49%	4239 83.86%	4209 84.43%	3710 79.82%	27170 80.63%
(d) # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = [(d) divided by (a)] times 100)	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*
(e) # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = [(e) divided by (a)] times 100)	277 6.42%	296 6.24%	285 5.69%	261 5.28%	271 5.36%	276 5.54%	268 5.77%	1934 5.74%
(f) Children included in "a" but not included in "b", "c", "d", or "e" above	30	34	37	19	32	37	58	247
(g) Overall Participation Rate = [(b+c+d+e)/a]	4282 99.30%	4712 99.28%	4973 99.26%	4922 99.62%	5023 99.37%	4948 99.26%	4590 98.75%	33450 99.27%

Source. Information Management System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010); Iowa Department of Education AYP Database, FFY 2009 (2009-2010). \* Indicates that Iowa's assessment is currently in development.

For FFY 2009 (2009-2010), the State of Iowa exceeded measurable and rigorous targets for participation rates in reading and math, at all grade levels.

The third measurement (C) of Indicator 3 is the performance of students with disabilities in statewide assessments of reading and math. Reading performance is summarized in Figure B3.4 and Table B3.4, while math performance is summarized in Figure B3.5 and Table B3.5. Please note that a total percentage for proficiency in grades 3-8 and 11, inclusive, for math and for reading is included in each table, but Iowa does not report on targets for these totals. Iowa set targets for each grade level and subject in the state's accountability workbook for ESEA, and those targets are reported here.

Figure B3.4 summarizes the trend for reading performance of students with disabilities from FFY 2008 (2008-2009) to FFY 2009 (2009-2010).



**Figure B3.4. Percent of Students with Disabilities Proficient on Regular and Alternate Assessments, Reading, FFY 2008 (2008-2009) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010), Grades 3-8 and 11.** Source. Iowa Department of Education AYP Database, FFY 2008 (2008-2009) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Table B3.4 presents FFY 2009 (2009-2010) reading performance data for children with disabilities regarding: (a) the number of children with IEPs in assessed grades; (b) the number and percent of children proficient in the regular assessment with no accommodations; (c) the number and percent of children proficient in the regular assessment with accommodations; (d) the number and percent of children proficient in the alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards; (e) the number and percent of children proficient in the alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards; (f) the number of children included in a but not b, c, d or e, and (g) the overall number and percent of children proficient.


**Table B3.4**  
**Performance of Children with Disabilities in Reading, Regular and Alternate Assessment**

	3	4	5	6	7	8	11	Total
(a) # of children with IEPs in assessed grades	4331	4742	5020	4940	5064	4983	4640	33720
(b) # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100)	523	468	445	283	269	234	233	2455
	12.08%	9.87%	8.86%	5.73%	5.31%	4.70%	5.02%	7.28%
(c) # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = [(c) divided by (a)] times 100)	809	1096	1250	814	816	904	1067	6756
	18.68%	23.11%	24.90%	16.48%	16.11%	18.14%	23.00%	20.04%
(d) # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = [(d) divided by (a)] times 100)	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*
(e) # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = [(e) divided by (a)] times 100)	194	191	181	92	135	152	137	1082
	4.48%	4.03%	3.61%	1.86%	2.67%	3.05%	2.95%	3.21%
(f) Children included in "a" but not included in "b", "c", "d", or "e" above	2805	2987	3144	3751	3844	3693	3203	23427
	1526	1755	1876	1189	1220	1290	1437	10293
(g) Overall Percent $[(b+c+d+e)/a]$	35.23%	37.01%	37.37%	24.07%	24.09%	25.89%	30.97%	30.52%

Source: Iowa Department of Education AYP Database, FFY 2009 (2009-2010). \* Indicates that Iowa's assessment is currently in development.

The State of Iowa did not meet the target in reading for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) for any grade. Performance in reading for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) improved from performance in reading for FFY 2008 (2008-2009), however, for grade 11.

Figure B3.5 summarizes trend for mathematics performance of students with disabilities from FFY 2008 (2008-2009) to FFY 2009 (2009-2010).



**Figure B3.5. Percent of Students with Disabilities Proficient on Regular and Alternate Assessments, Math, FFY 2008 (2008-2009) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010), Grades 3-8 and 11.** Source. Iowa Department of Education AYP Database, FFY 2008 (2008-2009) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Table B3.5 presents FFY 2009 (2009-2010) math performance data for children with disabilities regarding: (a) the number of children with IEPs in assessed grades; (b) the number and percent of children proficient in the regular assessment with no accommodations; (c) the number and percent of children proficient in the regular assessment with accommodations; (d) the number and percent of children proficient in the alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards; (e) the number and percent of children proficient in the alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards; (f) the number of children included in a but not b, c, d or e, and (g) the overall number and percent of children proficient.

**Table B3.5**  
**Performance of Children with Disabilities in Mathematics, Regular and Alternate Assessment**

	3	4	5	6	7	8	11	Total
(a) # of children with IEPs in assessed grades	4311	4744	5009	4940	5051	4981	4643	33679
(b) # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100)	544	503	447	323	290	221	225	2553
	12.62%	10.60%	8.92%	6.54%	5.74%	4.44%	4.85%	7.58%
(c) # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = [(c) divided by (a)] times 100)	1224	1441	1592	1221	1127	1028	969	8602
	28.39%	30.38%	31.78%	24.72%	22.31%	20.64%	20.87%	25.54%
(d) # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level achievement standards (percent = [(d) divided by (a)] times 100)	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*	0*
(e) # of children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = [(e) divided by (a)] times 100)	176	185	175	96	146	156	141	1075
	4.08%	3.90%	3.49%	1.94%	2.89%	3.13%	3.04%	3.19%
(f) Children included in "a" but not included in "b", "c", "d", or "e" above	2367	2615	2795	3300	3488	3576	3308	21449
	1944	2129	2214	1640	1563	1405	1335	12230
(g) Overall Percent $[(b+c+d+e)/a]$	45.09%	44.88%	44.20%	33.20%	30.94%	28.21%	28.75%	36.31%

Source: Iowa Department of Education AYP Database, FFY 2009 (2009-2010). \* Indicates that Iowa's assessment is currently in development.

The State of Iowa did not meet the target in math for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) for any grade. Performance in math for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) did not improve in any grade from FFY 2008 to FFY 2009.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

*Discussion of Improvement Activities That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).* Meeting targets for each indicator in the SPP is a priority for Iowa, and resources have been committed to each indicator and across indicators, to impact actual target data for each FFY on which performance is reported.

Consistent with activities documented in the SPP, several improvement activities were implemented to impact meeting the targets for this indicator. While activities have not changed, the headings used to describe each activity were changed to match the Improvement Activity headings in the APR Checklists.

Improvement activities, Measureable Outcomes, and Status/Next Steps are summarized in Table B3.6.

**Table B3.6**  
**Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

<b>Improvement Activity</b>	<b>Measurable Outcomes</b>	<b>Status/Next Steps</b>
<p><b>Provide technical assistance.</b> During the 2008-2009 school year, the Iowa Dept. of Education continued to provide Every Student Counts (ESC) professional development for the ten AEA math teams and the five Urban math teams who were participants. These teams then offered ESC professional development to the teachers they serve at the local level. The theme for this fifth year of ESC professional development was the Mathematics Iowa Core Curriculum. The strategies taught continued to be Teaching for Understanding, using problem-based instructional tasks, and meaningful practice.</p> <p>Currently, we are working on longitudinal data following the students identified during 2007-2008 and following them for the second year with ITBS and ITEDs. Even though these students were in a classroom of a teacher who was engaged in ESC PD during the 2007-2008 school year, it is unknown if the students had an opportunity to be in an ESC classroom during the 2008-2009 school year.</p> <p>A plan is being designed to evaluate ESC and this will include identifying ESC teachers each year in addition to following the ESC student achievement over several years. We will have access to student data through Project EASIER.</p>	<p>There were approximately 8170 students who were exposed to ESC with both AYP08 and AYP09 scores. Of that group, approximately 1005 students were on IEPs.</p> <p>In comparison to the national standard score of the ITBS and ITED in reading, 661 students on IEPs increased, 14 did not change, and 328 decreased.</p> <p>In mathematics, 670 increased, 26 did not change, and 306 decreased.</p>	<p>Ongoing for FFY 2009</p>
<p><b>Provide technical assistance.</b> During the 2009-2010 school year, Instructional Decision Making (IDM) (Iowa's interpretation of RTI) continued to be part of the state's initiatives Every Student Counts (ESC) and Every Learner Inquires (ELI). Professional Development materials for ESC and ELI reflect IDM connections. During FFY 2009 (2009-2010) continued to train the ESC presenters in IDM and struggling students of mathematics and have presenters use that training in AEA training. began more intensive work with ELI presenters for more intensive work with IDM and science.</p>	<p>ESC trainers were trained for 3 days on the characteristics of students with math disabilities, using research from Dr. David Allsopp and IDM principles. These trainers then create scenarios of different classroom make ups and presented ESC including the strategies and ideas learned in this three day training. ELI IDM training was given to the presenters and they incorporated the principles of IDM in their training of 09-10 school-year.</p>	<p>ESC and ELI are no longer supported with TA from the DE. State Teams have been created in the areas of Literacy, Math, Science, Social Studies. There is a member of the IDM team on the Literacy state</p>

Improvement Activity	Measurable Outcomes	Status/ Next Steps
		team and a member of the special education math team on the State Math Team.
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> Ongoing training in Universal Design for Learning (UDL) was expanded to include higher education faculty who prepare teachers. A skills-based training that combines UDL and co-teaching was under development for the 2009-2010 school year for SEA consultants.	Forty-five faculty from 16 teacher preparation institutions were trained in UDL. Plans were developed and information has been disseminated for 4 days of SEA skill-based training in UDL and co-teaching and this training was implemented in 2009-2010.	Address having the IHEs take on this work in the future.
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> Continue dissemination of information regarding the following approaches: collaborative teaching, specially designed instruction, differentiated instruction, Universal Design for Learning, and other related skill variants in relationship to collaborative teaching. A 4-page handout was developed in response to teacher and administrator requests for an easily accessible straightforward description of Iowa's consultative and collaborative teaching approaches. This is entitled <i>Iowa's Co-Teaching and Collaborative Consultation Model</i> . The document was disseminated in 2009-2010 with a companion document that outlines highly qualified special education teacher requirements ( <a href="http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=941&amp;Itemid=2603">Legal HQT Requirements for Students with IEPs</a> ). Both documents are available at <a href="http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=941&amp;Itemid=2603">http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=941&amp;Itemid=2603</a> .	2000 copies have been disseminated. Marketing of the document has begun.  Copies of the two new documents have been disseminated to SEA staff who provide school-based technical assistance.	Copies will go out as requests come in
<b>Program Development:</b> During the 2009-2010 School year, Muscatine School District began participating in a 3+ year professional development opportunity in the area of special education mathematics. This project will help the state of Iowa create a center of excellence in the area of special education mathematics. We will be doing the research on what is the professional development needed to help teachers meet the needs and raise scores of students with disabilities.	Special education teachers will improve their understanding of mathematics and learn pedagogy in order to improve students with IEPs' ITBS/ITED scores.	Continue with delivery of PD and implementation of project through 2013
<b>Program Development.</b> A workgroup was established that was responsible for a special education strategic plan for achievement	Comprehensive five-year plan to improve special education for students with disabilities with the result of improved reading and mathematics achievement.	Continue the work of this group and begin implementing actions in the plan.
<b>Provide Training and Professional Development:</b>  The Vinton-Shellsburg School District began working with the DE on an Action Research Project for Literacy at the end of the 2010 school year.	Establishment of Specially Designed Instruction in Reading Action Res. Site by May of 2010.	During the 2010-2011 school years, the Vinton-Shellsburg School district is an official Action Research Site in the



Improvement Activity	Measurable Outcomes	Status/ Next Steps
		state of Iowa in the area of improving literacy instruction for students on IEPs.
<p><b>Provide training/professional development.</b> Between 2009 and 2010, One Action Research Site was established to determine the effect of implementing school wide the <u>Content Literacy Continuum (CLC)</u> from KU.</p>	<p>Data will be gathered and will be analyzed at the end of the school year 2011.</p>	<p>Complete at the end of the 2011 school year.</p>
<p><b>Provide training/professional development.</b> Between 2009 and 2010, Two Action Research Sites were established to determine the effect of <u>Fusion Reading</u> (KU) when used with adolescent students with IEPs.</p>	<p>Two school districts which were Action Research sites, trained in <u>Fusion Reading</u>. During the summer of 2010 there were also 20 educators trained to be trainers and Coaches of Fusion Reading,</p>	<p>This will assist the state in maintaining sites that are using Fusion and will allow for its expansion as well. The state has been gathering data on the effect and will have these data at the end of the 2011 school year.</p>
<p><b>Provide training/professional development.</b> Between 2009 and 2010, focus on Instructional Coaching and having coaching as an integral part of professional learning being developed by the SEA.</p>	<p>During the 2009-2010 school year 1 Consultant from the DE has attended all the trainings that have taken place across the state.</p>	<p>The DE person is the liaison from the DE to this statewide group for the next 2 years and can assist with planning and actions relating to embedding this training into future efforts at both the DE and AEA level that are aimed at closing the achievement gap.</p>

*Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).* The analyses of data form the basis of discussion that follows.

On Indicator 3A, slippage is attributed to districts being held to higher targets to make AYP. Targets increased significantly in FFY 2009 (2009-2010), reducing the number of districts that were able to meet AYP.

On Indicator 3B, high performance was essentially maintained in FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and no discussion of progress or slippage is warranted.

On Indicator B3C, the SEA noted improvement only in grade 11 in reading. The SEA attributes this lack of improvement to a lack of focused strategies for improving instruction for students with disabilities in the state.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010 (2010-2011):**

Proposed activities for FFY 2010 (2010-2011) are discussed in Table B3.7. These activities are consistent with what was proposed in the FFY 2004 (2004-2011) State Performance Plan and describe activities to be implemented in FFY 2010 (2010-2011) that will allow Iowa to meet measureable and rigorous targets for both FFY 2010 (2010-2011) and the targets continuing in the SPP through FFY 2012 (2012-2013).

(Note: Activities listed as ongoing in Table B3.6 will continue in FFY 2010 (2010-2011), and are not listed in Table B3.7).

**Table B3.7**  
**Proposed Activities for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**

Proposed Activity	Proposed Personnel Resources	Proposed Timelines	Anticipated Outcomes
<b>Program Development.</b> Continue the efforts of a workgroup responsible for a special education strategic plan for achievement (strategic plan).	Bureau of Student and Family Support Service Consultants and Teaching and Learning Services Consultants representing Title I, IDM, Literacy, Mathematics, Indicator 3.	August 2010 – July 2013	Comprehensive 10-year plan to improve special education for students with disabilities with the result of improved reading and mathematics achievement.
<b>Improve Systems Administration and Monitoring.</b> Increase coordination of initiatives and efforts that promote and produce increased collaboration and efficiency that leads to greater outcomes for students with disabilities.	SEA bureau chiefs and consultants, AEAs, and IHEs.	August 2010 – July 2013	Alignment of efforts across all entities, SEA, AEAs, LEAs, and Institutes of Higher Education (IHE).  Increased collaborative efforts.  Increased student on IEP achievement.
<b>Improve Systems Administration and Monitoring.</b> Increase knowledge and support of researched, evidenced based, and promising best practice through data analysis and investigation.	Bureau of Student and Family Support Service Consultants and Teaching and Learning Services Consultants and AEAs.	August 2010 – July 2013	Increased alignment of resources and projects toward sustainable outcomes.  Increased achievement for students with IEPs at supported sites.
<b>Provide Training/Professional Development.</b> Increase the capacity of AEA and LEA educators that work with students on IEPs to work with one another in improving the outcomes of students with disabilities.	SEA provided professional development, AEAs, and national experts that assist districts with Iowa Core/Common Core.	August 2010 – July 2013	The Iowa Core Curriculum /Common Core aligned to the continuum of students with disabilities.  The performance of students with disabilities increased in reading and math on state assessments.

Proposed Activity	Proposed Personnel Resources	Proposed Timelines	Anticipated Outcomes
<b>Provide Training and Professional Development.</b> Continue with the Action Research Site, year one of a possible 5-year plan.	SEA coordinates the PD in collaboration with AEA.	August 2010-July 2013	<p>This project in Vinton-Shellsburg, will help the state determine what types of supports and learning is needed in order to close the gap in reading for persistently struggling students. This will also help the state to create a center of excellence in the area of Specially Designed Instruction in Reading within one of the AEAs in the state. Data will be gathered and analyzed and an evaluation plan is established.</p> <p>In addition: four smaller rural districts in Iowa are also participating in a similar project.</p>
<b>Professional Development.</b> Specially Designed Instruction in Mathematics. Continue with the Action Research Site and year 1 of 3.	SEA is coordinating this Action Research	August 2010-July 2013	During the 2010-11 School year, Muscatine School District will participate in a 3+ year professional development opportunity in the area of special education mathematics. This project will help the state of Iowa create a center of excellence in the area of special education mathematics. We will be doing the research on what is the professional development needed to help teachers meet the needs and raise scores of students with disabilities.
<b>Provide Training and Professional Development.</b> Closing the gap with adolescent literacy.	SEA will be collaborating with LEA and KU trainers	June 2011-July 2013	During the summer of 2011 a group of educators from Iowa will be trained to be official KU trainers in the Content Enhancement Routines from KU. Use of CE will grow and be sustained. Maintain data on districts receiving training and determine method for data analysis.
<b>Provide Training and Professional Development.</b> Closing the gap with adolescent literacy. Complete year 2 of Fusion Reading initiative in Dubuque.	SEA will be collaborating with LEA and KU trainers	July 2010-July 2013	Complete year two and analyze student data for effect.
<b>Professional Development.</b> Use of Instructional Coaches to change practice.	SEA is collaborating with AEAs	July 2010-July 2013	The SEA is interested in building the skills of special educators to coach one another on strategies that are needed to accelerate progress for students with IEPs. The SEA is using content from the Dr. Jim Knight training that is currently being conducted in Iowa on Instructional Coaching. The AEAs in Iowa have sent teams through this training during the last 2 years. On-site Coaching is being used in the Action Research Sites in the state.

Proposed Activity	Proposed Personnel Resources	Proposed Timelines	Anticipated Outcomes
<b>Program Development /Provide Training and Professional Development.</b> Diagnosis, assessment, analysis, and matching to specially designed instruction.	The SEA is coordinating this work with educators from AEAs and LEAs.	Jan. 2011- July 2013	During the 2010-2011 school year a work team is developing tools, materials, guidance and PD for LEAs and AEAs for skills in the following areas: diagnosis, assessment, analysis, and matching to specially designed instruction. Tools will be delivered and training provided.
<b>Provide Training and Professional Development.</b> Connection with IHEs across the state that provide pre-service training in literacy to special educators.	The SEA is coordinating this work with educators from many of the IHEs in Iowa.	June 2011- July 2013	During the summer of 2011 the SEA is providing professional learning opportunities with many of the IHEs across the state of Iowa. This will enhance the pre-service learning of entering special ed. Teachers in regards to the teaching of reading. There are plans for future collaborative work also.

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

The Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) was developed by SEA staff reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities, and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included the State Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), the Area Education Agencies (AEA) administration, and the Iowa Department of Education staff.

In this APR, Iowa will: (a) report actual target data, (b) describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2008 (2008-2009), (c) describe the review, and, if appropriate, revision, of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 (2008-2009) data, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b), (d) report on improvement activities and explain progress or slippage, and (e) justify any changes to targets or improvement activities.

The SEA will report to the public progress/and or slippage in meeting the "measurable and rigorous targets" found in the SPP/APR by posting on the State of Iowa Department of Education website ([http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592)) sometime after Feb 1, 2011 but no later than April 1, 2011, the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) APR submitted to OSEP. Any changes to the SPP accepted by OSEP will be posted within 30 days of receipt of the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) response letter to Iowa expected for receipt prior to July 1, 2011.

Performance of AEAs and LEAs on appropriate indicators will be posted by June 1, 2011. AEA profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590). District profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591). Iowa's

Accountability Workbook is available at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308).

<b>Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE</b>
---

**Indicator 4(A):** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

The following measurement was a requirement of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) for both the six-year State Performance Plan and each Annual Performance Report.

**Measurement:**

- A. A. Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

\*Significant discrepancy is defined as 2% above the state average in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.

The percent of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities is a performance indicator. Therefore, each state was allowed by OSEP to set their own target from baseline data. The SEA, with input from stakeholder groups, established measurable rigorous targets ranging from 1.50% to 1.00% of districts identified as having significant discrepancy in suspensions and expulsions over the span of the six-year State Performance Plan. The SEA's definition of significant discrepancy is 2.00% above the state average in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. The state uses both in-school and out-of-school suspensions as well as expulsions in making this calculation.


In-school and out-of-school suspension are both defined as an "administrative or school board removal of a student from school classes or activities for disciplinary reasons," with a student still being under the supervision of school officials during an in-school suspension. Expulsion is defined as "a school board removal of a student from school classes and activities for disciplinary reasons," (Collecting and Reporting Juvenile Incident and Discipline Data in Iowa Schools, 2005).

The percent of districts with significant discrepancy is calculated by (1) identifying districts 2.00% or more above of the SEA's rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year, (2) dividing the number of districts with this significant discrepancy by the total number of districts in the state, and (3) multiplying by 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008 (2008-2009)	A. 1.30% or less of districts are identified as having a significant discrepancy of 2.00% above the State average in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):**

Figure B4.1 depicts suspension and expulsion data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009) as the percent of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy of 2.00% above the state average in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.



**Figure B4.1. SEA Percent of Districts Identified with Significant Discrepancy of Suspensions and Expulsions and the SEA Target.** Source. Iowa Department of Education Project EASIER Tables, FFY 2004 (2004-2005) through FFY 2008 (2008-2009).

Figure B4.1 shows that the SEA met the FFY 2008 (2008-2009) target of 1.30 percent of districts having a significant discrepancy of 2.00% above the state average in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year, with the actual target data being 1.11% of districts. Performance in FFY 2008 (2008-2009) also represents an improvement from FFY 2007 (2007-2008).

Table B4.1 provides the actual numbers used to address the measurement for Indicator 4A.

Table B4.1 Number of Districts Exceeding Measurement, Total Number of Districts, and Percent of Districts Exceeding Measurement	
Description	Number
(a) Number of students with IEPs enrolled, ages 6-21	61418
(b) Number of Students with IEPs suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days	339
(c) State average percent of students with IEPs suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days [c = (b/a) * 100]	0.55
(d) Threshold for significant discrepancy = state average + 2.00% (Percent = c+2.00)	2.55
(e) Number of districts with an average suspension/expulsion rate greater than the threshold (d)	4
(f) Total number of districts	361
(g) B4 Percent = e/f*100	1.11

Source. Iowa Department of Education Project EASIER Tables and Iowa 618 Table 4, FFY 2008 (2008-2009).

**State Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices Relating to the Development and Implementation of IEPs, the Use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and Procedural Safeguards to Ensure Compliance with Part B of the IDEA as Required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)**

Districts identified as significantly discrepant based on FFY 2008 (2008-2009) data participated in a district review consisting of the following areas relating to discipline/suspensions and expulsions:

- (1) A review and examination of district discipline data,
- (2) A review of policies, procedures and practices,
- (3) A review of documents (i.e., individual IEPs, student handbook to ensure alignment with board policies, etc.),
- (4) A review of the district Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and
- (5) The development of a Corrective Action Plan, if necessary.

Attached is a copy of the *District Review Protocols for Suspension and Expulsions*

The completed reviews and corrective action plan were reviewed by the SEA and an onsite visit was conducted to verify findings. The onsite visit consisted of the review of individual IEPs, review of documents (i.e., prior written notice, change in placement and manifestation determinations, functional behavioral assessments, behavior intervention plans, etc.). A final determination of findings was made by the SEA and a review of the Corrective Action plan was conducted to ensure alignment with the findings.

Results from the review of policies, procedures and practices conducted by the SEA for districts identified as significantly discrepant for FFY 2008 (2008-2009) are provided in Table B4.2.

**Table B4.2**  
**Findings for Indicator B4, FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

<b>Compliance Requirement</b>	<b>Number of Programs Monitored</b>	<b>Number of Programs Reviewed</b>	<b>Number of Findings</b>
<i>Review and Revision of Policies</i> 34 CFR § 300.170(b)	361	4	0
<i>Prior Notice by the Public Agency</i> 34 CFR § 300.503	361	4	0
<i>Authority of School Personnel</i> 34 CFR § 300.530	361	4	1

Source. Iowa Project EASIER, FFY 2008 (2008-2009) and Indicator B4 Review Protocol FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Data in Table B4.2 indicate that for FFY 2009 (2009-2010), 4 districts were reviewed and one finding was issued regarding the consistent implementation of the discipline provisions of IDEA 2004 (*Authority of School Personnel* 34 CFR § 300.530). As corrective action, the SEA required the district to develop a corrective action plan to address all areas of noncompliance with corrections to be made as soon as possible, but no later than one year.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

Discussion of Improvement Activities That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Meeting targets for each indicator in the SPP is a priority for Iowa, and resources have been committed to each indicator and across indicators, to impact actual target data for each FFY on which performance is reported.



Consistent with activities documented in the SPP, several improvement activities were implemented to impact meeting the targets for this indicator. While activities have not changed, the headings used to describe each activity were changed to match the Improvement Activity headings in the APR Checklists.

Improvement activities, Measureable Outcomes, and Status/Next Steps are summarized in Table B4.4.

**Table B4.4**  
**Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

<b>Improvement Activity</b>	<b>Measurable Outcomes</b>	<b>Status/Next Steps</b>
<b>Improve data collection and reporting.</b> Review changes to data proposed by OSEP and ensure measurement addresses OSEP's definitions, if approved.	Capability of reporting on and being in compliance for B4B in FFY 2009 (2009-2010)	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Improve data collection and reporting.</b> Data were verified within the Project EASIER system.	Improved accuracy of suspension and expulsion data.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Improve systems administration and monitoring.</b>  Suspension and expulsion data, as well as progress Monitoring/outcome data from School-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and the Challenging Behavior Project, were analyzed with the following key stakeholders: Special Education Advisory Panel, SEA Staff, statewide PBIS Leadership Team, and Learning Supports Advisory Team.	Stakeholders determined that (1) the Challenging Behavior Project, which provides direct training, extensive clinical experience, and technical assistance to identified Behavior Specialists in each AEA, must continue in order to increase statewide capacity to work with students with significant challenging behaviors, and (2) PBIS should continue their focus on secondary and tertiary levels of support, which includes the development of Mental Health Wraparound as part of the continuum of supports	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Improve systems administration and monitoring.</b>  <b>Clarify/examine/develop policies and procedures.</b> Modified and developed a new set of review protocols to assist AEAs and districts in the review of policies, procedures and practices related to Indicator B4	A newly developed and implemented set of review protocols for Indicator B4.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Program development.</b> Restructure/strengthen PBIS: (1) Complete a comprehensive PBIS program review (2) Use results of program review to restructure/strengthen Iowa's PBIS initiative (3) Establish standardized and online core content training for statewide PBIS trainers	(1) Completed review (2) Results used to inform SEA of gaps, needs, and strengths of the statewide PBIS system; results used to develop technical assistance and sustainability of efforts (3) Standardized and accessible core content training across the state	Activities 1 and 2 occur each year and are completed. Activity 3 is ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Program development.</b> Restructure/strengthen secondary level of supports: (1) Develop a comprehensive list of programs/strategies within Supplemental/ Secondary supports across the 6 content areas of Learning Supports (2) Develop an online tool to access (1) (3) Use results of PBIS program review to address secondary level of supports	(1) Comprehensive list of programs/strategies for secondary supports completed (2) Comprehensive list accessible (3) Results of PBIS program review analyzed and recommendations to PBIS Leadership Team for consideration in technical assistance and sustainability of efforts	Activity 3 is completed. Activities 1 and 2 are ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Program development.</b> Restructure/strengthen tertiary level of supports specific to discipline and behavior through the implementation of 4	(1) Procedures Manual Training developed (2) Awareness campaign developed (dissemination in FFY 2009)	(1) Iowa's Procedures Manual is online; seclusion and restraint training occurred via the Iowa Communications Network with

<p>goals which all contain similar activities [(a)Develop/ implement content materials, (b)Develop online support materials and training, (c) Develop evaluation processes/ materials]:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Establish standardized/online procedures manual training [which includes seclusion and restraint]</li> <li>(2) Establish Awareness Campaign</li> <li>(3) Establish professional development (Skill building 1 and Skill building 2) to develop skills across general and special educators to support students with or at-risk of behavioral problems</li> <li>(4) Establish Technical Assistance Consultant (TAC) Professional Development to develop behavioral specialists within the AEA</li> </ol> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(5) Develop a comprehensive list of programs/strategies within Intensive/Tertiary Supports across the 6 content areas of Learning Supports</li> <li>(6) Develop an online tool to access (5)</li> <li>(7) Use results of PBIS program review to address secondary level of supports</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(3) Professional development materials for Skill Building 1 completed</li> <li>(4) Targeted training and support developed for Lead Technical Assistance Consultants and AEA TAC Teams (see <u>Challenging Behavior</u> below)</li> <li>(5) Comprehensive list of programs/strategies for secondary supports completed</li> <li>(6) Comprehensive list accessible</li> <li>(7) Results of PBIS program review analyzed and recommendations to PBIS Leadership Team for consideration in technical assistance and sustainability of efforts</li> </ol>	<p>support via online presentations for personnel access</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(2) Discipline brochure disseminated statewide</li> <li>(3) Professional development in the area of behavior has been merged with the training/technical assistance provided to AEA Behavior Specialists within the Challenging Behavior Project</li> <li>(4) Ongoing (see Challenging Behavior Project below)</li> <li>(5) Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)</li> <li>(6) Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)</li> <li>(7) Completed annually</li> </ol>
<p><b>Program development.</b> Restructure the <u>Challenging Behavior</u> Project through Goal 4 above, Establish Technical Assistance Consultant (this position is now referred to as AEA Behavior Specialists) Professional Development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Establish 3-tiered partnership to implement appropriate behavioral supports</li> <li>(2) Develop and implement TAC specialized content and practicum/ internship curricula</li> <li>(3) Develop/implement evaluation processes/materials</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Partnerships for the project have been established</li> <li>(2) The structure and process for the Challenging Behavior project have been established</li> <li>(3) Evaluation structure established; initial results obtained.</li> </ol>	<p>The Challenging Behavior Project has been established; 48 AEA Behavior Specialists have participated in clinical experiences and training; 120 AEA Behavior Specialists and other personnel have participated in direct training on behavior principles and strategies via distance education (Iowa Communications Network) This project is ongoing through FFY 2010.</p>
<p><b>Program development.</b> Continue Project LINCIS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Strengthen cross-agency/organization collaboration (through the Learning Supports Advisory Team)</li> <li>(2) Develop linguistically appropriate and culturally competent guidelines</li> <li>(3) Establish a statewide Crisis Intervention Program</li> <li>(4) Establish a Family-Centered, School-based Mental Health Wraparound Model</li> <li>(5) Evaluate collaborative processes, training/TA and impact on system-level responsiveness to mental health needs</li> </ol>	<p>Overall - Increased number of educational personnel trained in the referral of students with mental health needs. Specifically -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Established cross-agency/organization collaboration to continue to develop tertiary system for mental health supports</li> <li>(2) Completed linguistically and culturally competent guidelines</li> <li>(3) Established crisis intervention program by Fall 2009</li> <li>(4) 6 pilot sites with established wrap processes by 2009-2010</li> <li>(5) Results from evaluation used to develop state-wide tertiary system for mental health supports within schools by 2010-2011</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Cross-agency/organization collaboration established</li> <li>(2) Linguistically/culturally competent rating rubric developed and applied across training materials</li> <li>(3) Crisis intervention plan training developed and delivered</li> <li>(4) Pilot sites (6) have been established; personnel have attended 4-6 training and direct technical assistance dates</li> <li>(5) Evaluation indicates increase in the number of personnel trained in the referral of students with mental health needs; evaluation is ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)</li> </ol>
<p><b>Clarify/examine/develop policies and procedures.</b> Any identified refinement of LEA Review process for suspensions and expulsions will be developed during FFY 2009-2010 with implementation in fall of 2010.</p>	<p>Implementation of any new processes and or technical support in Fall of 2010</p>	<p>Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)</p>
<p><b>Provide technical assistance.</b> The SEA</p>	<p>All LEAs and AEAs were notified of</p>	<p>Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)</p>

uses suspension and expulsion data in making annual AEA and LEA determinations regarding districts in need of review of policies, procedures and practices	determinations status. One school district found to be in need of assistance based on FFY 2007 data was significantly discrepant for Indicator 4A.	
--	--	--

*Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).* The analyses of data form the basis of discussion that follows.

The state percent of districts identified as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year decreased from 2.75% in FFY 2007 (2007-2008) to 1.11% in FFY 2008 (2008-2009). This 1.64% decrease, from 10 districts to 4 districts, is attributed to (a) continued efforts by the SEA to provide technical assistance to both AEAs and LEAs regarding discipline, (b) continued efforts by the SEA to promote the adoption of PBIS and/or other positive behavior supports and interventions in districts, (c) continued efforts by the SEA and AEAs to help districts understand discipline data.

SEAs are required to report for Indicator B4 the following specifics around correction of noncompliance from the FFY 2008 (2008-2009) Annual Performance Report using FFY 2007 (2007-2008) data:

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009) using 2007-2008 data	7
2. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	7
3. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0
4. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
6. Number of FFY 2008 findings not yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

#### **Actions Taken Regarding Noncompliance:**

The SEA uses data from Project EASIER to track the number of students with IEPs suspended and expelled for greater than 10 days by district to determine (a) the statewide rate of suspensions and expulsions, and (b) district rates of suspensions and expulsions. The percent of districts with significant discrepancy was then calculated by (1) identifying districts above 2% of the SEA's rate of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year, (2) dividing the number of districts with this significant discrepancy by the total number of districts in the state, and (3) multiplying by 100. The SEA conducts a review of policies, procedures, and practices in order to determine noncompliance for districts identified as exceeding the state's average by more than 2%.

The SEA determined that for FFY 2008 (2008-2009), districts were considered noncompliant in this area primarily due to lack of (a) review and revision of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, (b) the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), and procedural safeguards, and (c) training of staff regarding the discipline provisions of IDEA 2004 and PBIS.

For FFY 2008 (2008-2009), districts (a) reviewed and revised policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, (b) reviewed and/or revised procedures for giving parents prior written notice for students involved in change of placements consistent with the discipline provisions of IDEA 2004, and (c) reviewed and revised district policies, procedures and practices regarding the discipline provisions of IDEA 2004.

As part of a corrective action plan, districts are required to provide evidence to the SEA that any required corrections were completed and when the corrections were completed. The SEA also verified that in each program for which noncompliance was identified, the specific regulatory requirements were being correctly implemented by ensuring that the LEA had adopted and been trained in statewide procedures for the development and implementation of IEPs that are aligned with Iowa's Special Education Rules, Iowa Code, and Federal Code. Monitoring of corrective actions is carried out by the SEA's monitoring consultant.

While Iowa was able to verify correction of all noncompliance for FFY 2008 (2008-2009), the state has procedures in place should timely correction not take place in the future. Iowa's Administrative Rules of Special Education provide the SEA with the latitude to take enforcement actions in cases of noncompliance with the IDEA, including, but not limited to, requiring a corrective action plan, withholding payments under Part B, and referring the matter for enforcement to the department of justice or state auditor. [IAC 281-41.604]

***Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent):***

Iowa verified the correction of noncompliance identified in the FFY 2008 (2008-2009) APR by (a) verifying that all child-specific noncompliance was corrected to 100%, and (b) verifying that each LEA that was performing below 100% compliance in FFY 2008 (2008-2009) is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010 (2010-2011):**

Proposed activities for FFY 2010 (2010-2011) are discussed in Table B4.5. (Note: Activities listed as ongoing in Table B4.4 will continue in FFY 2010 (2010-2011), and are not listed in Table B4.5).

**Table B4.5  
Improvement Activities Proposed for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**

Proposed Activity	Proposed Personnel Resources	Proposed Timelines	Anticipated Outcomes
Transition Project LINCS into statewide implementation of Mental Health Wraparound within the PBIS model by continuing with Cohort 2 schools	2 SEA staff AEA Personnel	FFY 2010 and ongoing	(1) Increase in school personnel skill to implement Mental Health Wraparound (2) Decrease in suspension/expulsion and dropouts of students with significant behavioral/mental health issues. (3) Embedded wraparound in the PBIS model as year three through five training
Provide six workshop training dates for PBIS Statewide trainers and coaches in the area of secondary supports; beginning tertiary supports training for select AEA personnel	1 SEA Staff National Experts	FFY 2010	Increase in AEA skills in secondary and tertiary supports
Develop additional suspension and expulsion protocols for districts that have been identified as having a significant discrepancy for more than 1 year	1 SEA Staff	Fall 2012	Provide support to AEAs and districts regarding the monitoring and continuous improvement activities regarding B4

## Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

## Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please see pages 1-5 for State Performance Plan Development

## Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

## Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

The following measurement was a requirement of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) for both the six-year State Performance Plan and each Annual Performance Report.

**Measurement:**

- B. Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

\*Significant discrepancy is defined as 2% above the state average in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

Out-of-school suspension is defined as an “administrative or school board removal of a student from school classes or activities for disciplinary reasons.” An expulsion is defined as “a school board removal of a student from school classes and activities for disciplinary reasons.” (Collecting and Reporting Juvenile Incident and Discipline Data in Iowa Schools, 2005)


Suspension and expulsion data are reported to the SEA by the districts and aggregated to the AEA level. In the past, collecting, analyzing and reporting suspension and expulsion data for students with disabilities have been the responsibility of the Information Management System (IMS) in Iowa. The Basic Educational Data Survey (BEDS) system is considered to be the system used for all students. IMS contains data on students with disabilities only; BEDS contains data for students with and without disabilities. However, disaggregating by students with and without disabilities for analysis and reporting has not been possible using the BEDS system. Iowa has been working toward a seamless system to establish a common database for all students that would allow disaggregate data for students with and without disabilities: Project EASIER. The Project EASIER database has been piloted; the first full year of implementation was FFY 2004 (2004-2005).

Suspension and expulsion data are collected via Project EASIER for all students with and without disabilities enrolled in Iowa's schools. Data are collected and entered throughout the year by qualified personnel at the district level; data are then analyzed and reported annually by the SEA. Suspension and expulsion data are analyzed between school districts to determine the percent of

districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities by race / ethnicity for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by the number of districts in the State times 100.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):**

Baseline data for Indicator B4B for FFY 2008 (2007-2008) are summarized in Figure B4B.1. Numbers used in the calculations are provided in Table B4B.1.



**Figure B4B.1. SEA Percent of Districts Identified with Significant Discrepancy of Suspensions and Expulsions by Race/Ethnicity and the SEA Target, FFY 2008 through FFY 2012.** Source. Iowa Department of Education Project EASIER Tables, FFY 2008 (2008-2009).

**Table B4B.1**  
**Number of Districts Exceeding Measurement, Total Number of Districts, and Percent of Districts Exceeding Measurement**  
**by Race/Ethnicity**

Description	Caucasian	African-American	Hispanic	Asian	Native American
(a) Number of students with IEPs enrolled, ages 6-21	50565	5818	4041	627	367
(b) Number of students with IEPs suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days	185	116	31	2	5
(c) State average percent of students with IEPs suspended or expelled for greater than ten days [c=(b/a) * 100]	0.37	1.99	0.77	0.32	1.36
(d) threshold for significant discrepancy (c +2.00%)	2.37	3.99	2.77	2.32	3.36
(e) Number of districts with an average suspension/expulsion rate greater than the threshold (d)	3	4	1	0	0

Description	All races
(f) Total number of districts with a significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity in 2008-2009 (all races/ethnicities from e above)	8
(g) Total number of districts in 2008-2009	361
(h) Percent of districts with a significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity= f/g *100	2.22
(i) Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race/ethnicity, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.	2
(j) B4B percent = i/g *100	0.55

Source. Iowa Department of Education Project EASIER, FFY 2008 (2008-2009).

#### Discussion of Baseline Data:

Indicator B4B data were submitted for the first time using FFY 2008 (2008-2009). Eight districts had a significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity, two of which were determined to have policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy. While the SEA works continuously to ensure that districts have policies and procedures aligned with the IDEA and uses practices designed to reduce the B4B percentage to 0.00, SEA personnel were encouraged by the outcome of the initial Indicator B4B review.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2005 (2005-2006)</b>	<p>A: 1.50% or fewer districts will have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>B: 0.00% of districts will have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p>
<b>2006 (2006-2007)</b>	<p>A: 1.50% or fewer districts will have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>B: 0.00% of districts will have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p>
<b>2007 (2007-2008)</b>	<p>A: 1.50% or fewer districts will have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>B: 0.00% of districts will have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p>
<b>2008 (2008-2009)</b>	<p>A: 1.30% or fewer districts will have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>B: 0.00% of districts will have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p>
<b>2009 (2009-2010)</b>	<p>A: 1.20% or fewer districts will have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with</p>



	<p>IEPs.</p> <p>B: 0.00% of districts will have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p>
<b>2010 (2010-2011)</b>	<p>A: 1.00% or fewer districts will have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>B: 0.00% of districts will have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p>
<b>2011 (2011-2012)</b>	<p>A: 1.00% or fewer districts will have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>B: 0.00% of districts will have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p>
<b>2012 (2012-2013)</b>	<p>A: 1.00% or fewer districts will have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>B: 0.00% of districts will have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p>

**State Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices Relating to the Development and Implementation of IEPs, the Use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and Procedural Safeguards to Ensure Compliance with Part B of the IDEA as Required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)**

Districts identified as significantly discrepant based on FFY 2008 (2008-2009) data participated in a district review consisting of the following areas relating to discipline/suspensions and expulsions:

- (1) A review and examination of district discipline data,
- (2) A review of policies, procedures and practices,
- (3) A review of documents (i.e., individual IEPs, student handbook to ensure alignment with board policies, etc.),
- (4) A review of the district Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, and
- (5) The development of a Corrective Action Plan, if necessary.

The completed reviews and corrective action plan were reviewed by the SEA and an onsite visit was conducted to verify findings. The onsite review consisted of the review of individual IEPs, review of documents (i.e., prior written notice, change in placement and manifestation determinations, functional behavioral assessments, behavior intervention plans, etc.). A final determination of findings was made by the SEA and a review of the Corrective Action plan was conducted to ensure alignment with the findings.

Results from the review of policies, procedures and practices conducted by the SEA for districts identified as significantly discrepant for FFY 2008 (2008-2009) are provided in Table B4.2.

**Table B4.2**  
**Findings for Indicator B4B, FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

<b>Compliance Requirement</b>	<b>Number of Programs Monitored</b>	<b>Number of Programs Reviewed</b>	<b>Number of Findings</b>
<i>Review and Revision of Policies</i> 34 CFR § 300.170(b)	361	8	1
<i>Prior Notice by the Public Agency</i> 34 CFR § 300.503	361	8	1
<i>Authority of School Personnel</i> 34 CFR § 300.530	361	8	2

Source. Iowa Project EASIER, FFY 2008 (2008-2009) and Indicator B4 Review Protocol FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Data in Table B4.2 indicate that for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) a total of 8 districts were reviewed. The review resulted in one finding of noncompliance relating to *Review and Revision of Policies 34 CFR § 300.170(b)*; one finding of noncompliance relating to *Prior Notice by the Public Agency 34 CFR § 300.503*; and two findings of noncompliance relating to provisions of *Authority of School Personnel 34 CFR § 300.530*.

As corrective action, the SEA required districts to develop a corrective action plan to address all areas of noncompliance with corrections to be made as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the date of finding.

#### **Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

Based on (1) the structure outlined in the *Overview of State Performance Plan Development*, (2) Iowa's System, (3) broad stakeholder input, and (4) trend and current data, the strategies summarized in Table B4B.2 will be completed over the duration of the State Performance Plan through June 30, 2013.

**Table B4B.2**  
**Improvement Activities Proposed for FFY 2010 (2010-2011) through FFY 2012 (2012-2013)**

<b>Proposed Activity</b>	<b>Proposed Personnel Resources</b>	<b>Proposed Timelines</b>	<b>Anticipated Outcomes</b>
<b>Clarify/examine/develop policies and procedures.</b> Any identified refinement of the LEA Review process for suspensions and expulsions	1 Compliance and Monitoring Consultant with assistance from the Learning support Team	Fall 2009-July 2010  Review each year	Implementation of any new processes and or technical support in Fall of 2010 with ongoing refinements/improvements

Proposed Activity	Proposed Personnel Resources	Proposed Timelines	Anticipated Outcomes
will be developed during FFY 2009-2010 with implementation in fall of 2010.			made annually
<b>SEA Discussion/Work-group facilitated by NCCRC</b> The SEA will participate in monthly phone conferences with other states in the region regarding monitoring processes relating to Indicator B4B.	1-2 SEA Consultants	Monthly	Improve the review/monitoring process and outcomes relating to Indicator B4B

# **IOWA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**



**District Review Protocols**  
**SUSPENSIONS AND EXPULSIONS**  
**2010 – 2011 School Year**  
*(FFY 2008 Data)*

## Discipline

### Suspensions and Expulsions

Suspension and expulsion rates refer to the number of students with disabilities suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days. Suspension in regard to this indicator (B4) refers to both In-School and Out-of-School suspensions because it is looking at the use of Suspension as a disciplinary action. Out-of-School suspensions are instances in which a child is temporarily removed from his/her regular school for disciplinary purposes to another setting (e.g., home, behavior center). This includes both removals in which no IEP services are provided because the removal is 10 days or less, as well as removals in which the child continues to receive services according to his/her IEP. The same is true for In-School suspensions, and includes removals in which no IEP services are provided because the removal is 10 days or less, as well as removals in which the child continues to receive services according to his/her IEP. Note: Up to half a day is counted as half a day, half a day or more is counted as a full day.

Expulsion is defined as “a school board removal of a student from school classes and activities for disciplinary reasons.” (Collecting and Reporting Juvenile Incident and Discipline Data in Iowa Schools, 2005)

A district may be found to have significant discrepancy in the rate of Suspensions and Expulsions as outlined in the Annual Performance Report, IDEA Part B for Indicator B4A or Indicator B4B or for both B4A and B4B as defined below.

**B4A – A significant discrepancy above the State average for the rate of Suspensions and Expulsions for students with an Individual Education Program (IEP) for greater than 10 days in a school year and/or**

**B4B – A significant discrepancy above the State average for the rate of Suspensions and Expulsions for students with an Individual Education Program (IEP) of a race/ethnic subgroup for greater than 10 days in a school year**

### Reviewing Suspension and Expulsion

The Iowa Department of Education has identified certain activities that assist districts in looking at the root causes for a higher-than-desirable rate of Suspensions/Expulsions. The review is a focused review of a school district's policies, procedures and practices that closely impact the incidence, duration and type of disciplinary action. It also includes analyzing district data, reviewing district documents, reviewing student IEPs, and examining related issues and practices.

## INSTRUCTIONS

Carefully read the following directions.

**IMPORTANT:** Contact Cheryl Merical at the Iowa Department of Education to verify receipt of this document!  
[Cheryl.Merical@iowa.gov](mailto:Cheryl.Merical@iowa.gov)

---

**STEP 1:**      **Complete all 3 Sections as follows:**

**Section 1: *Review of Data***

- Examine district discipline data noting areas of concern or areas in need of further investigation
- Complete the table by answering the questions with a brief explanation/answer

**Section 2: *Review of Policies, Procedures and Practices***

- Complete chart of yes/no questions
- Any question answered 'no' is considered a finding of non-compliance and shall be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the data of such finding
- The district must provide documentation of correction to the department

**Section 3: *Review of documents and Individual IEPs***

- Complete table of yes/no questions
- Complete list of students suspended/expelled for more than 10 days (consecutive and cumulative)
- Complete IEP file reviews
  - Must complete IEP/file reviews of students with IEPs suspended/expelled for more than 10 days during 2009-2010 school year and the current 2010-2011 school year
- Any finding of noncompliance on a current IEP shall be corrected immediately and documentation of correction must be provided to the department

**Section 4: *Review of Positive Behavior Strategies***

- Complete table of yes/no questions

---

**STEP 2:**

- Review findings from each section
- Complete **Summary of Findings Form**

---

**STEP 3:**

- Following Section 4 is a **Corrective Action Plan** template

- Based on the review and summary of findings from Step 2, develop a **Corrective Action Plan**.
- 

**STEP 4:**

- Complete the **Revisions of Policies, Procedures and Practices** form
  - If applicable, attach revisions to the form
  - Attach copies of completed IEP review forms
- 

**STEP 5:**

- Complete **Statement of Assurances** (Superintendent Signature required)
- Mail a completed copy of the entire document and required attachments to the Iowa Department of Education at the following address:

**Cheryl Merical, Consultant  
Bureau of Student and Family Support  
Services  
Iowa Department of Education  
400 E. 14<sup>th</sup> Street  
Des Moines, IA 50319**

**NOTE:** An electronic version of this document may be obtained by e-mailing  
[Cheryl.Merical@iowa.gov](mailto:Cheryl.Merical@iowa.gov)

---

## REVIEWER INFORMATION SHEET

School District \_\_\_\_\_ AEA \_\_\_\_\_ Date Completed \_\_\_\_\_

Contact/Lead Person \_\_\_\_\_ Position \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_ Ph# \_\_\_\_\_

*Please list all individuals involved in the completion of this review.*

Name	Position	AEA or District	Building	Sections Reviewed



**SECTION 1****DATA REVIEW**

<b>Section 1A: Review of Data</b> <b>Please provide a brief explanation/answer regarding the following questions.</b>
1) Describe how does the district tracks and monitors rates of suspension and expulsions? Who is responsible for this activity?
2) Describe how does the district ensure that data are entered into the system in a timely and accurate manner? Who is responsible for this activity?
3) Describe how the district monitors and reviews suspension and expulsion data disaggregated by students with and without IEPs? Who is responsible for this activity?
4) Describe how the district monitors and reviews suspension and expulsion data by students disaggregated by racial/ethnic subgroups? Who is responsible for this activity?
5) How often do principals review disaggregated discipline data by buildings and/or classrooms?
6) How often are disaggregated data shared and analyzed among both regular and special educators within the district?

<p>7) How are buildings with problematic rates of suspensions of students with an IEP identified? Describe any past interventions implemented to address problematic rates.</p>
<p>8) Is the district currently implementing PBIS?</p> <p>If yes, what buildings and for how long?</p>
<p>9) Is the district currently implementing other forms of school-wide behavioral initiatives?</p> <p>If yes describe.</p>
<p>10) Are there suspension trends or other areas that need to be further analyzed?</p> <p>If yes, please list or describe.</p>

## SECTION 2

## POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND PRACTICES REVIEW

- ◆ Any question answered 'No' is considered a finding of non-compliance and the district shall revise or develop new policies, procedures and/or practices that are in alignment with federal and state laws and regulations. Corrections shall be made as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the data of finding/s.
- ◆ Districts shall publicly report changes and provide a copy of changes to the Iowa State Department of Education.
- ◆ During site visits districts, will be required to provide copies of policies and procedures to the Department of Education as well as provide evidence of implementation of any practice in which there is a 'Yes' response.

Are the district's policies, procedures and practices in alignment with federal and state law and regulations?			
Focus Area - Authority of school personnel IAC 281-41.530	Policy	Procedure	Practice
1. School personnel consider any unique circumstances on a case-by-case basis when determining whether a change in placement is appropriate for a student with a disability who violates a code of student conduct ( <i>Case-by-case determination</i> ) [IAC 281-41.530(1)].	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
2. Suspensions and expulsions are applied to students with disabilities to the extent they are applied to students without disabilities (as long as no removal constitutes a change of placement) [IAC 281-41.530(2)].	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
3. Services are provided to a student with a disability after the student has been removed from his or her current placement for ten school days (consecutive or cumulative) in the same school year and during any subsequent days of removal [IAC 281-41.330(4)].	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
4. When a suspension would exceed ten consecutive school days, and the behavior that gave rise to the violation of the school code is determined not to be a manifestation of the child's disability, school personnel may apply disciplinary procedures to children with disabilities in the same manner and for the same duration as the procedures would be applied to children without disabilities, except as provided in subrule 41.530(4) [IAC 281-41.530(3)].	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
5. <i>Services.</i> 41.530(4) a. A child with a disability who is removed from the child's current placement pursuant to subrule 41.530(3) or 41.530(7) must receive the following:  (1) Educational services, as provided in subrule 41.101(1), so as to enable the child to continue to participate in the			

Are the district's policies, procedures and practices in alignment with federal and state law and regulations?			
general education curriculum, although in another setting, and to progress toward meeting the goals set out in the child's IEP; and	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
(2) As appropriate, a functional behavioral assessment, and behavioral intervention services and modifications, that are designed to address the behavior violation so that it does not recur.			
b. The services required by 41.530(4) "a" and "c" to "e" may be provided in an interim alternative educational setting.	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
c. A public agency is required to provide services during periods of removal to a child with a disability who has been removed from his or her current placement for ten school days or less in that school year, only if it provides services to a child without disabilities who is similarly removed.	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
d. After a child with a disability has been removed from his or her current placement for ten school days in the same school year, if the current removal is for not more than ten consecutive school days and is not a change of placement under rule 281—41.536(256B,34CFR300), school personnel, in consultation with at least one of the child's teachers, shall determine the extent to which services are needed, as provided in subrule 41.101(1), so as to enable the child to continue to participate in the general education curriculum, although in another setting, and to progress toward meeting the goals set out in the child's IEP.	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
e. If the removal is a change of placement under rule 281—41.536(256B,34CFR300), the child's IEP team determines appropriate services under 41.530(4) "a."	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
<b>Focus Area – Manifestation Determination IAC 281-41.530(5)</b>			
6. a. Within ten school days of any decision to change the placement of a child with a disability because of a violation of a code of student conduct, the AEA, the LEA, the parent, and relevant members of the child's IEP team, as determined by the parent and the AEA and LEA, review all relevant information in the student's file, including the child's IEP, any teacher observations, and any relevant information provided by the parents to determine:	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No

Are the district's policies, procedures and practices in alignment with federal and state law and regulations?			
(1) If the conduct in question was caused by, or had a direct and substantial relationship to, the child's disability; or	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
(2) If the conduct in question was the direct result of the failure by the AEA or LEA to implement the IEP.			
b. The conduct must be determined to be a manifestation of the child's disability if the AEA, the LEA, the parent, and relevant members of the child's IEP team determine that a condition in either 41.530(5) "a"(1) or (2) was met.	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
c. If the AEA, the LEA, the parent, and relevant members of the child's IEP team determine the condition described in 41.530(5) "a"(2) was met, the public agency must take immediate steps to remedy those deficiencies.	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
7. <i>Determination that behavior was a manifestation.</i> If the AEA, the LEA, the parent, and relevant members of the IEP team make the determination that the conduct was a manifestation of the child's disability, the IEP team proceeds as follows:			
a. Conduct a functional behavioral assessment, unless the AEA or LEA had conducted a functional behavioral assessment before the behavior that resulted in the change of placement occurred, and implement a behavioral intervention plan for the child; or	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
b. If a behavioral intervention plan already has been developed, review the behavioral intervention plan and modify it, as necessary, to address the behavior; and	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
c. Except as provided in subrule 41.530(7), return the child to the placement from which the child was removed, unless the parent and the public agency agree to a change of placement as part of the modification of the behavioral intervention plan. [IAC 281-41.3530(6)].	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
<b>Focus Area – Prior Notice by the Public Agency</b>			
<b>41.530(8) Notification.</b> On the date on which the decision is made to make a removal that constitutes a change of placement of a child with a disability because of a violation of a code of student conduct, the LEA must notify the parents of that decision and provide the parents the procedural safeguards notice described in rule 281-41.504(256B,34CFR300).	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No

### SECTION 3 DOCUMENT AND IEP REVIEW

The following items will apply only to School Board Policies.

School Board Policy Review	
<b>The following is regarding discriminatory practices.</b>	
Is there a policy to ensure that students are free from discriminatory practices in the educational program?	Yes    No
<b>Does the district have policies or documentation related to the provision of the following special education and related services?</b>	
Provision of a free and appropriate public education.	Yes    No
Provision of special education and related services.	Yes    No
Provision of special education and related services in the least restrictive environment.	Yes    No
Protecting the confidentiality of personally identifiable information.	Yes    No
Graduation requirements for eligible individuals.	Yes    No
Requirements for administration of medications, including a written medication administration record.	Yes    No
Special health services.	Yes    No
Documentation that the Board of Education provides special education programs and services for its resident children that comply with rules of the State Board of Education implementing Iowa Code chapters 256, 256B, 273, and 280.281-	Yes    No
Letter from the AEA Education Agency Special Education Director indicating the district is in compliance.	Yes    No
Documents which address the provisions for meeting the needs of at-risk students.	Yes    No
Valid and systemic procedures and criteria to identify at-risk students throughout the district's school-age population.	Yes    No
Determination of appropriate ongoing educational strategies for alternative options education programs.	Yes    No
<b>The following is pertaining to Title IV-A</b>	
A crisis management plan and security procedures for the time when students are at school and on their way to and from school.	Yes    No
A code of conduct policy for all students that clearly delineates the responsibilities of students, teachers and administrators in maintaining a safe, drug-free school environment.	Yes    No

You will need **both** School Board Policies and Student Handbook for this section of the review.

Issue	School Board Policy	Student Handbook
Graduation requirements- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are they present?</li> <li>Are they clearly stated?</li> </ul>	Yes      No Yes      No	Yes      No
Requirements meet current state mandates?	Yes      No	Not applicable

The following refers to student responsibility and discipline, including attendance.

SBP= School Board Policy

SH= Student Handbook

Issue	Is it addressed? (Yes or No)		Is the policy and handbook in alignment?	
	SBP	SH		
Attendance – tardy policy	Yes    No	Yes    No	Yes    No	
Attendance- truancy policy	Yes    No	Yes    No	Yes    No	
Use of tobacco	Yes    No	Yes    No	Yes    No	
Use or possession of alcoholic beverages or any controlled substance	Yes    No	Yes    No	Yes    No	
Violent, destructive, and seriously disruptive behavior	Yes    No	Yes    No	Yes    No	
Suspension, expulsion, emergency removal, and physical restraint	Yes    No	Yes    No	Yes    No	
Weapons	Yes    No	Yes    No	Yes    No	
Out-of-school behavior	Yes    No	Yes    No	Yes    No	
Participation in extracurricular activities	Yes    No	Yes    No	Yes    No	
Academic progress	Yes    No	Yes    No	Yes    No	
Citizenship	Yes    No	Yes    No	Yes    No	
<b>Briefly describe the district's practice for informing students about the content of the student handbook and ensuring their understanding.</b>				

Provide a list of all students with an IEP suspended and/or expelled for more than 10 days (consecutive or cumulative) during the 2009-2010 school year and for the current 2010-2011 school year. Review all files using the IEP review form on the following page.

2009 – 2010					
Student Name	Date of Birth	Race/Ethnicity	Grade	Building	Total # Days Suspended/Expelled

2010 – 2011					
Student Name	Date of Birth	Race/Ethnicity	Grade	Building	Total # Days Suspended/Expelled

Expand table or make copies as needed

All IEPS must be reviewed using the following form

**INDIVIDUAL IEP REVIEW FORM**  
**Suspensions and Expulsions**  
 2010-2011 School Year  
 (FFY08 Data)



District/AEA \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Review \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Name &amp; Title \_\_\_\_\_ Building \_\_\_\_\_

IEP Review for Suspension and Expulsions						
Indicator B4	Student Initials	Student Initials	Student Initials	Student Initials	Student Initials	Student Initials
	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	DOB	DOB	DOB	DOB	DOB	DOB
	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
<b>Procedural Integrity</b>	Y = Yes N = No N/A = Not Applicable					
1. For more than 10 <u>consecutive</u> days (an automatic change in placement), was a manifestation determination meeting convened?						
2. For more than 10 <u>cumulative</u> days, did the district determine if it constituted a change of placement?						
3. If the decision above (the 10 cumulative days) was determined a change of placement, was a manifestation determination meeting held and a decision made?						
4. If the behavior <u>was</u> a manifestation, did the IEP team conduct a review of an existing the Behavior Intervention Plan? Or if no BIP existed, did the team conduct a Functional Behavior Assessment to develop one?						
5. If the behavior <u>was</u> a manifestation, was the child returned to his/her						

IEP Review for Suspension and Expulsions						
Indicator B4	Student Initials	Student Initials	Student Initials	Student Initials	Student Initials	Student Initials
	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	—	—	—	—	—	—
	DOB	DOB	DOB	DOB	DOB	DOB
	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	—	—	—	—	—	—
<b>Procedural Integrity</b>	Y = Yes N = No N/A = Not Applicable					
educational placement?						
6. If the behavior was <u>not</u> a manifestation, did the district provide academic instruction?						
7. If the removal was <u>not</u> a change of placement, did the district provide academic instruction?						
8. Were services provided to the student once he/she had been removed from his/her current placement for ten school days (consecutive or cumulative) in the same school year and during any subsequent days of removal?						
9. On the date on which a decision was made to make a removal that constituted a change of placement, was the parent notified of that decision and provided the procedural safeguards notice?						
<b>IEP Components/Considerations</b>						
10. Are there goals in the area of behavior?						
11. Were positive behavioral interventions and supports considered and addressed in the IEP?						

IEP Review for Suspension and Expulsions						
Indicator B4	Student Initials	Student Initials	Student Initials	Student Initials	Student Initials	Student Initials
	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	DOB	DOB	DOB	DOB	DOB	DOB
	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Procedural Integrity	Y = Yes N = No N/A = Not Applicable					
12. If a BIP exists, was it based on the results of a FBA?						
13. If a BIP exists that was based on the results of a FBA, is there alignment between the BIP and the FBA (e.g., does treatment match function)?						

Expand table or make copies as needed

**A COPY OF ALL IEP REVIEW FORMS MUST BE ATTACHED WHEN SUBMITTING FINAL DOCUMENT**

## SECTION 4

### POSITIVE BEHAVIOR STRATEGIES REVIEW

*The purpose of this section is to assist the district in checking the integrity in which PBIS and/or other strategies are being implemented. It also serves to assist a district in identifying possible strategies that may be adopted as practice.*

Answer YES if the practice occurs consistently. Answer NO if the practice occurs infrequently or never.

**NOTE:** A NO answer does not result in a finding of noncompliance.

AREA	Yes or No
------	-----------

AREA	Yes or No
<b>EXPECTATIONS DEFINED</b>	
1) Has the staff of the building agreed to 5 or fewer positively stated school rules for behavior? Is there documentation that the staff has been involved in agreeing to these rules?	Yes No
2) Are these expectations/rules posted in at least 8-10 locations within the school that are visible to students on a daily basis?	Yes No
<b>TEACHING EXPECTATIONS</b>	
3) Is there a documented system for teaching behavioral expectations to students on an annual basis?	Yes No
4) Can most students and staff name the expectations for behavior in the school?	Yes No
<b>RECOGNITION SYSTEM</b>	
5) Is there a documented system for recognizing and rewarding student behavior?	Yes No
6) Do a majority of the staff routinely recognize their students for exhibiting expected behavior? Is there documentation of that practice?	Yes No
7) When asked, can students describe the recognition/reward system? Do they value the methods used to recognize their behavior? Do the majority of students report being recognized by staff at least once a day?	Yes No
<b>RESPONSE TO VIOLATIONS</b>	
8) Is there a documented system for dealing with and reporting specific behavioral violations?	Yes No
9) Do the majority of staff members agree with administration on what problems are office managed and what problems are classroom managed?	Yes No
10) Is there a documented crisis plan for responding to extremely dangerous behaviors? Is all staff knowledgeable of this plan?	Yes No
<b>MONITORING &amp; DECISION-MAKING</b>	
11) Does the discipline referral form list the following information – student/grade; time; referring staff; problem behavior; location; persons involved; probable motivation; and administrative decision?	Yes No
12) Is there a system for collecting and summarizing discipline data – e.g. software program?	Yes No
13) Is discipline data reported to the entire staff at least 3 times a year?	Yes No
14) Is discipline data used for making decisions regarding the design, implementation and revision of school-wide effective behavior supports?	Yes No
<b>MANAGEMENT</b>	
15) Does the school improvement plan include behavior support systems as one of the top 3 priorities?	Yes No
16) Are there specific activities to enhance behavior support systems within the school? Are these activities evaluated on at least an annual basis using a variety of data sources, including discipline data?	Yes No
<b>DISTRICT LEVEL SUPPORT</b>	
17) Does the school budget allocate money to support building and maintaining positive behavior support systems within the school?	Yes No

**Activities, Strategies and Practices Implemented by the District**

**The Iowa Department of Education recognizes that many districts implement activities, strategies and practices to address discipline concerns prior to conducting this review. Please describe any activities, strategies and/or practices that the district has begun to implement that is not covered in a previous section of this review.**

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Review sections 1 - 4 and in the chart below, provide a brief summary of findings for each section (e.g., areas of need, areas of strength, areas of non-compliance, areas that need to be explored further, etc.). This summary of findings will assist you in the development of the Corrective Action Plan.

<p align="center"><b>Section 1: Data Review</b></p>	
<p><b>Summary of Findings (and possible hypothesis):</b></p>	
<p align="center"><b>Section 2: Policies, Procedures and Practices Review</b></p>	
<p><b>Summary of Findings (a copy of any new or revised policy, procedure or practice needs to be attached).</b></p>	
<p><b>Areas of noncompliance (list or describe):</b></p>	
<p align="center"><b>Section 3: Document and IEP Review</b></p>	
<p><b>Summary of Findings:</b></p>	

Please note findings of noncompliance on any current individual IEP (include student initials and DOB). The district shall make immediate correction of any finding and provide a copy of the corrected IEP to the Department of Education as soon as the correction is made.

#### Section 4: Positive Behavior Strategies Review

##### Summary of Findings

**CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN**  
**Suspensions and Expulsions**  
 2010-2011 School Year  
 (FFY08 Data)

District/AEA: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Submission: \_\_\_\_\_

Person Responsible \_\_\_\_\_ Position \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail/ \_\_\_\_\_

Using the *Summary of Findings*, the district shall develop a corrective Action Step for each area of noncompliance identified. Additional Action Steps should be developed for areas where continuous improvement is indicated. Copy the table as needed. As you formulate your corrective *Action Step Details* for each identified area, address the following:

1. **Pattern:** Where is the noncompliance (or area that needs improvement) occurring (e.g., specific buildings, grades, personnel)?
2. **Intervention:** Based on your analysis, what action(s) will best correct the noncompliance?
3. **Measurement:** How will you document that the corrective action(s) has been implemented?
4. **Evaluation:** How will you know that this item has been corrected:
  - a) What data will you look at?
  - b) What standard/criteria will you use to judge that the problem has been resolved?
5. **Assimilation:** Once this item of noncompliance has been corrected, how will compliance be sustained beyond the duration of this CAP?

<b>1 out of _____ Identify/Describe Area of Noncompliance Identified or Area in Need of Improvement</b>  _____ _____	<b>Person Monitoring Implementation</b>  _____ _____
<b>Action Step Details: (Address questions 1-5 above)</b>  1. Pattern:  2. Intervention:  3. Measurement:  4. Evaluation:  5. Assimilation:	<b>Optional Review Dates:</b>  Date 1 _____ _____  Date 2 _____ _____  Date 3 _____ _____



	Date 4 _____ _____ <b>Completion Date</b> _____ _____
--	--

<b>2 out of _____ Identify/Describe Area of Noncompliance Identified or Area in Need of Improvement</b> _____ _____	<b>Person Monitoring Implementation</b> _____ _____
<b>Action Step Details: (Address questions 1-5 above)</b> 1. Pattern: 2. Intervention: 3. Measurement: 4. Evaluation: 5. Assimilation:	<b>Optional Review Dates:</b> Date 1 _____ _____ Date 2 _____ _____ Date 3 _____ _____ Date 4 _____ _____ <b>Completion Date</b> _____ _____

<b>3 out of _____ Identify/Describe Area of Noncompliance Identified or Area in Need of Improvement</b> _____ _____	<b>Person Monitoring Implementation</b> _____ _____
<b>Action Step Details: (Address questions 1-5 above)</b> 1. Pattern: 2. Intervention: 3. Measurement:	<b>Optional Review Dates:</b> Date 1 _____ _____ Date 2 _____ _____

<p>4. Evaluation:</p> <p>5. Assimilation:</p>	<p>_____</p> <p><b>Date 3</b> _____</p> <p>_____</p> <p><b>Date 4</b> _____</p> <p>_____</p> <p><b>Completion Date</b> _____</p> <p>_____</p>
---	---

**Copy table as needed**

**REVISION OF POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND PRACTICES**

If your review resulted in the change of any policy, procedure or practice with respect to the discipline of children with disabilities, please note the revisions made and attach a copy of the new policy, procedure and/or practice. Also note the date and how the changes were publicly reported.

<b>Policy, Procedure and/or Practice (List all revisions)</b>	<b>Describe how changes were/will be publicly reported</b>	<b>Date</b>

**ATTACH A COPY OF NEW OR REVISED POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND PRACTICES**

**Statement of Assurances**

**Suspensions and Expulsions**

2010-2011 School Year  
(FFY08 Data)

**District:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Date of Submission:** \_\_\_\_\_

The \_\_\_\_\_ Community School District hereby assures the Iowa Department of Education that the information presented in this review of suspension and expulsions is accurate and the review was conducted according to the protocols set forth in this document.

The \_\_\_\_\_ Community School District further assures the Iowa Department of Education that the district administration has reviewed, approved and supports the Corrective Action Plan set forth in this document.

**Superintendent (Printed Name)** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_

**Superintendent (Signature)** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_

---

**CHECKLIST**

---

- ☐ **Reviewer Information Sheet**
  - ☐ ***SECTION 1: Data Review***
  - ☐ ***SECTION 2: Policies, Procedures and Practices***
  - ☐ ***SECTION 3: Document and IEP Review***
    - List of students with IEPs suspended for more than 10 days for current school year and for 2009-2010 school year
    - IEP Review forms
  - ☐ ***SECTION 4: Positive Behavior Strategies Review***
  - ☐ **Summary of Findings Form**
    - Includes list of findings of noncompliance in policies, procedures and practices
    - Includes list of findings of noncompliance on individual IEPs
  - ☐ **District Action Plan**
  - ☐ **Revision of Policies, Procedures and Practices Form**
    - Copies of new or revised policies , procedures and/or practices are attached
  - ☐ **Statement of Assurance signed by district Superintendent**
- 

**Mail a completed copy of the entire document and required attachments to the Iowa Department of Education at the following address:**

Cheryl Merial, Consultant  
Bureau of Student and Family Support  
Services  
Iowa Department of Education  
400 E. 14<sup>th</sup> Street  
Des Moines, IA 50319

Electronic versions may be submitted to  
[Cheryl.merial@iowa.gov](mailto:Cheryl.merial@iowa.gov)

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)

**Overview of the Annual Performance Plan Development:**

The Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) was developed by State Education Agency (SEA) staff reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these components and comments were compiled. Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) data were analyzed with the following key stakeholders: Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Area Education Agency (AEA) administration, and the Iowa Department of Education staff.

In this APR the SEA will report on efforts to improve performance, improvement activities described in the State Performance Plan that were implemented in FFY 2009 (2009-2010), the outcomes of improvement activities implemented in FFY 2009 (2009-2010), and changes to improvement activities to be reported on for FFY 2010 (2010-2011).

The SEA will report to the public progress/and or slippage in meeting the “measurable and rigorous targets” found in the SPP/APR by posting on the State of Iowa Department of Education website ([http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592)) sometime after Feb 1, 2011 but no later than April 1, 2011, the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) APR submitted to OSEP. Any changes to the SPP accepted by OSEP will be posted within 30 days of receipt of the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) response letter to Iowa expected for receipt prior to July 1, 2011.

Performance of AEAs and LEAs on appropriate indicators will be posted by June 1, 2011. AEA profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590). District profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591). Iowa’s Accountability Workbook is available at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308).

<b>Monitoring Priority:</b> FAPE in the LRE
---

**4. Indicator 5:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a) (3) (A))

The following measurement for this indicator was a requirement of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) for both the six-year State Performance Plan and each Annual Performance Report.

<b>Measurement:</b>
---------------------

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.</li> <li>B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.</li> <li>C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.</li> </ul> |
|---|

**Measurable and Rigorous Target:**

The provision of children/youth with IEPs provided a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) is a performance indicator. Therefore, each state was allowed by OSEP to set their own target from baseline data. The SEA, with input from stakeholder groups, established measurable and rigorous targets for the three subcomponents of this indicator.


FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2009</b> (2009-2010)	<p><b>A. 65.00% of children with IEPs ages 6-21 are inside the regular class 80% or more of the day.</b></p> <p><b>B. 12.50% of children with IEPs ages 6-21 are inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.</b></p> <p><b>C. 3.60% of children are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</b></p>

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

Iowa's process of General Supervision ensures that decisions about placement are based on the needs of each individual child. Iowa's State Rules of Special Education, Area Education Agency Procedures Manuals for Special Education, and District Plans for Special Education, all contain provisions about decision-making for eligibility for special education services, and on goals and services that constitute a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive setting being made by a team of individuals, including parents, based on the unique needs of each child.

Data reported below are generated from Iowa's Information Management System for Special Education (IMS) and are identical to data reported in Iowa's 618 Table 3 on the Implementation of FAPE Requirements for 2009. These data are valid and reliable and reflect Iowa's special education count date of October 30, 2009 (which falls between October 1 and December 1, 2009). Data represent all students, as sampling is not allowed for Indicator B5.

Figure B5.1 presents the State baseline, measureable and rigorous targets, and actual target data through FFY 2009 (2009-2010) for the percent of children with IEPs aged six through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day.




**Figure B5.1. SEA Percent of Children with IEPs Ages 6-21 Inside the Regular Class 80% or More of the Day.** Source. Iowa Information Management System, FFY 2004 (2004-2005) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010), Iowa 618 Table 3, FFY 2004 (2004-2005) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Iowa did not meet the state target for Indicator 5A for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Results of the State data indicate a decrease from 61.81% of children who remained in general education at least 80% of the day in FFY 2008 (2008-2009) to 61.72% in FFY 2009 (2009-2010).




Figure B5.2 presents the State baseline, targets, and data through FFY 2009 (2009-2010) for the percent of children with IEPs ages 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.



**Figure B5.2. SEA Percent of Children with IEPs Ages 6-21 Inside the Regular Class Less Than 40% of the Day.** Source. Iowa Information Management System, FFY 2004 (2004-2005) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010), Iowa 618 Table 3, FFY 2004 (2004-2005) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Iowa met the target for Indicator 5B for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Results of the State data indicate an increase from 7.72% of children in general education less than 40% of the day in FFY 2008 (2008-2009) to 8.36% in FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Figure B5.3 presents the State baseline, targets, and data through FFY 2009 (2009-2010) for the percent of children with IEPs ages six through 21 served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.




**Figure B5.3. State Percent of Children with IEPs Ages 6-21 Served in Public or Private Separate Schools, Residential Placements, or Homebound or Hospital Placements.** Source. Iowa Information Management System, FFY 2004 (2004-2005) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010), Iowa 618 Table 3, FFY 2004 (2004-2005) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Iowa met the target for Indicator 5C for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Results of the State data indicate a decrease from 3.52% of children in residential and separate facilities in FFY 2008 (2008-2009) to 2.33% in FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Indicator 5 data were analyzed by regions. The following three figures and tables summarize AEA-level results of measurements 5A, 5B, and 5C. (Note: AEAs are the subrecipients of Part B funds in the state of Iowa and are considered Iowa's LEAs for the purposes of reporting in the SPP and APR, per the State Eligibility Document.)

Figure B5.4 depicts AEA measureable and rigorous targets and actual target data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010) for the percent of children with IEPs ages six through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day. Three AEAs met the target and five showed improvement in FFY 2009 (2009-2010).



**Figure B5.4. Two-Year Performance Summary of Percent of Children with IEPs Ages 6-21 Inside the Regular Class 80% or More of the Day, by AEA.** Source. Iowa Information Management System, FFY 2008 (2008-2009) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010), and Iowa 618 Table 3, FFY 2008 (2008-2009) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Table B5.1 provides raw numbers and percents for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) of children and youth with IEPs ages 6-21 inside the regular education class 80% or more of the day, by AEA and for the State.


**Table B5.1**  
**AEA and SEA Number and Percentage of Children with IEPs Ages 6-21**  
**Inside the Regular Class 80% or More of the Day**

AEA	1	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	State
N Setting	2757	5244	2475	3434	5073	8597	2916	2504	987	3275	37262
N Total	4145	9179	3744	5614	8136	14411	4577	3960	1455	5148	60369
Percentage	66.51	57.13	66.11	61.17	62.35	59.66	63.71	63.23	67.84	63.62	61.72

Source. Iowa Information Management System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010), and Iowa 618 Table 3, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Results in Table B5.1 are consistent with the measurement, and no explanation of variance is required.

Figure B5.5 presents the AEA measureable and rigorous target and actual target data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009) through 2009 (2009-2010) for the percent of children with IEPs ages six through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day. Nine of the 10 AEAs met the target in FFY 2009 (2009-2010).



**Figure B5.5. Two-Year Performance Summary of Percent of Children with IEPs Ages 6-21 Inside the Regular Class Less Than 40% of the Day, by AEA.** Source. Iowa Information Management System, FFY 2008 (2008-2009) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010), and Iowa 618 Table 3, FFY 2008 (2008-2009) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Table B5.2 provides raw numbers and percents, at the AEA and State levels, of children and youth with IEPs ages 6-21 inside the regular education class less than 40% of the day.


**Table B5.2**  
AEA and SEA Number and Percentage of Children with IEPs Ages 6-21  
Inside the Regular Class Less Than 40% of the Day

AEA	1	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	State
N Setting	268	651	215	780	866	1146	349	287	133	349	5044
N Total	4145	9179	3744	5614	8136	14411	4577	3960	1455	5148	60369
Percentage	6.47	7.09	5.74	13.89	10.64	7.95	7.63	7.25	9.14	6.78	8.36

Source. Iowa Information Management System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and Iowa 618 Table 3, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Results in Table B5.2 are consistent with the measurement, and no explanation of variance is required.

Figure B5.6 summarizes AEA measureable and rigorous targets and actual target data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010) for the percent of children with disabilities ages six through 21 served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements. Eight of 10 AEAs met the target in FFY 2009 (2009-2010).



**Figure B5.6. Two-Year Performance Summary of Percent of Children with IEPs Ages 6-21 Served in Public or Private Separate Schools, Residential Placements, or Homebound or Hospital Placements, for AEAs and the State of Iowa.**

Source. Iowa Information Management System, FFY 2008 (2008-2009) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010), and Iowa 618 Table 3, FFY 2008 (2008-2009) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Table B5.3 summarizes raw numbers and percents of children and youth with IEPs ages 6-21 served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements, for each AEA and for the State of Iowa.

**Table B5.3**  
**AEA and SEA Number and Percentage of Children with IEPs Ages 6-21 Served in Public or Private Separate Schools, Residential Placements, or Homebound or Hospital Placements**

<b>AEA</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>State</b>
N Setting	95	370	40	68	135	444	19	168	17	49	1405
N Total	4145	9179	3744	5614	8136	14411	4577	3960	1455	5148	60369
Percentage	2.29	4.03	1.07	1.21	1.66	3.08	0.42	4.24	1.17	0.95	2.33

Source. Iowa Information Management System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and Iowa 618 Table 3, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Results in Table B5.3 are consistent with the measurement, and no explanation of variance is required.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

Discussion of Improvement Activities That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Meeting targets for each indicator in the SPP is a priority for Iowa, and resources have been committed to each indicator and across indicators to impact actual target data for each FFY on which performance is reported.

Consistent with activities documented in the SPP, several improvement activities were implemented to impact meeting the targets for this indicator. While activities have not changed, the headings used to describe each activity were changed to match the Improvement Activity headings in the APR Checklists.

Improvement activities, Measureable Outcomes, and Status/Next Steps are summarized in Table B5.4.

**Table B5.4**  
**Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

<b>Improvement Activity</b>	<b>Measurable Outcomes</b>	<b>Status/Next Steps</b>
<b>Clarify/examine/develop policies and procedures.</b> SEA will examine policies, procedures and practices of districts in Iowa with exemplary LRE data.	SEA will gain useful Information from schools on practices that have a positive effect on placement in the least restrictive environment.	Ongoing through FFY 2009 (2009-2010)
<b>Improve data collection and reporting.</b> The SEA conducted desk audits to assess the validity and reliability of LRE calculations and resulting data.	Analysis of data indicated that IEP teams were not calculating LRE accurately or reliably. Over 20 training sessions were provided for over 100 AEA consultants and administrators, LEA administrators, and data entry personnel statewide. Training covered LRE calculations and correct data entry procedures. Subsequent desk audits conducted by the SEA verified and ensured the accuracy of every student's LRE information.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Clarify/examine/develop policies and procedures.</b> The SEA required Area Education Agencies to write improvement plans addressing Part B indicators of concern.	All AEAs interpreted results of LRE data.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Clarify/examine/develop policies and procedures.</b> SEA's system of compliance monitoring identified and provided for the correction of problems in LRE calculation.	LEAs and AEAs used compliance data to improve LRE.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)

*Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).*

Iowa did not meet the measureable and rigorous state target for percent of children inside the regular class 80% or more of the day, with actual target data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) being 61.72%, a decrease from actual target data obtained during FFY 2008 (2008-2009). SEA personnel attribute slippage on measurement 5A to normal variations in data, since the slippage is less than one-tenth of one percent.

Iowa met the measureable and rigorous state target for percent of children inside the regular class less than 40% of the day, with actual target data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) being 8.36%. This represents slippage, however, from actual target data obtained during FFY 2008 (2008-2009). SEA personnel attribute slippage on measurement 5B to increased accuracy of placement data in Iowa's Information Management System (IMS).

Iowa met the measureable and rigorous state target for percent of students served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements with actual target data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) being 2.33%, a decrease and significant improvement from actual target data obtained during FFY 2007 (2007-2008). SEA personnel explain the improvement shown on measurement 5C to increased accuracy of placement data in Iowa's Information Management System (IMS).

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010 (2010-2011):**

Proposed activities for FFY 2010 (2010-2011) are discussed in Table B5.5. Activities listed as ongoing in Table B5.4 will continue in FFY 2010 (2010-2011) and are not listed in Table B5.5.

**Table B5.5**  
**Improvement Activities Proposed for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**

Proposed Activity	Proposed Personnel Resources	Proposed Timelines	Anticipated Outcomes
<b>Provide Training/Professional Development</b> Framework for Effective Instruction for student with significant disabilities		Ongoing through FFY 2012 (2012-2013)	Professional development offerings to LEA and AEA personnel.  Analysis of Iowa Alternate Assessment 1% achievement data and increased opportunity to access the general curriculum and %LRE.
<b>Provide Training/Professional Development</b> Significant disabilities literacy and communication project		Ongoing through FFY 2012 (2012-2013)	Analysis of Iowa Alternate Assessment 1% achievement data and increased opportunity to access the general curriculum and %LRE.
<b>Clarify/examine/develop policies and procedures</b> The SEA required LEAs to develop District Developed Special Education Service Delivery Plans with descriptions of the full continuum of services and supports.		Ongoing through FFY 2012 (2012-2013)	Districts will provide the full continuum of services and supports for students, allowing students to move along the continuum and increase time spent in the least restrictive environment.

Iowa proposes the following revisions to targets for Indicator B5 for FFY 2010 through FFY 2012:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2010 (2010-2011)</b>	<p><b>A. 75.00% of children with IEPs ages 6-21 will be served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day.</b></p> <p><b>B. 12.00% of children with IEPs ages 6-21 will be served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.</b></p> <p><b>C. 3.50% of children with IEPs ages 6-21 will be served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</b></p>
<b>2011 (2011-2012)</b>	<p><b>A. 75.00% of children with IEPs ages 6-21 will be served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day.</b></p> <p><b>B. 11.00% of children with IEPs ages 6-21 will be served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.</b></p>

	<b>C. 3.30% of children with IEPs ages 6-21 will be served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</b>
<b>2012 (2012-2013)</b>	<b>A. 80.00% of children with IEPs ages 6-21 will be served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day.</b> <b>B. 10.00% of children with IEPs ages 6-21 will be served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.</b> <b>C. 3.10% of children with IEPs ages 6-21 will be served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</b>



**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

In the Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) Instruction Sheet, OSEP states that:

*States are not required to report on Indicator 6 in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.*

Therefore, consistent with OSEP's directions, Iowa is not reporting on Indicator B6 for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

**Monitoring Priority: Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 6:** Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Measurement:**

- A. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program)divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

Consistent with OSEP's guidance on Indicator 6, states need not report on Indicator 6 for FFY 2009.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)****Overview of the Annual Performance Plan Development:**

The Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) was developed by State Education Agency (SEA) staff reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these components and comments were compiled. Early Childhood Outcome (ECO) data were analyzed with the following key stakeholders: Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Area Education Agency (AEA) administration, and the Iowa Department of Education staff.

In this APR the SEA will report on efforts to improve performance, improvement activities described in the State Performance Plan that were implemented in FFY 2009 (2009-2010), the outcomes of improvement activities implemented in FFY 2009 (2009-2010), and changes to improvement activities to be reported on for FFY 2010 (2010-2011).

The SEA will report to the public progress/and or slippage in meeting the “measurable and rigorous targets” found in the SPP/APR by posting on the State of Iowa Department of Education website ([http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592)) sometime after Feb 1, 2011 but no later than April 1, 2011, the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) APR submitted to OSEP. Any changes to the SPP accepted by OSEP will be posted within 30 days of receipt of the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) response letter to Iowa expected for receipt prior to July 1, 2011.

Performance of AEAs and LEAs on appropriate indicators will be posted by June 1, 2011. AEA profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590). District profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591). Iowa’s Accountability Workbook is available at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308).

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 7:** Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a) (3) (A))

The following measurement for this indicator was a requirement of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) for both the six year State Performance Plan and each Annual Performance Report.

**Measurement:**

## Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

## Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning =  $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$ .
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers =  $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$ .
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it =  $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$ .
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers =  $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$ .
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers =  $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$ .

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:**

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:**

Percent =  $[\# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in category (d)} \div [\# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (d)}] \times 100$ .

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:** Percent =  $[\# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (e)} \div \text{the total } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)}] \times 100$ .

**Measurable and Rigorous Target:**

Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) is a performance indicator. Therefore, each state was allowed by OSEP to set their own target from baseline data. The SEA, with input from stakeholder groups, established measurable and rigorous targets for the three subcomponents of this indicator.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2009 (2009-2010)</b>	<p>Outcome A, Summary Statement 1: 69.75% of children will have substantially increased their rate of growth with respect to social-emotional skills.</p> <p>Outcome A, Summary Statement 2: 57.04% of children will be functioning within age expectations with respect to social-emotional skills.</p> <p>Outcome B, Summary Statement 1: 77.47% of children will have substantially increased their rate of growth with respect to acquisition and use of knowledge and skills.</p> <p>Outcome B, Summary Statement 2: 38.42% of children will be functioning within age expectations with respect to acquisition and use of knowledge and skills.</p> <p>Outcome C, Summary Statement 1: 60.17% of children will have substantially increased their rate of growth with respect to use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>Outcome C, Summary Statement 2: 58.48% of children will be functioning within age expectations with respect to use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p>

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) for children exiting early childhood special education services are presented in Figures B7.1 through B7.6. Progress data and actual numbers used in the calculations are presented in Tables B7.1, B7.2 and B7.3. Iowa's criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" is a child who has been rated as a 6 or 7 on the ECO Summary form.

Figure B7.1 illustrates the percent of preschool children with IEPs who substantially increased their rate of growth on Outcome A, positive social-emotional skills, for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Table B7.1 provides the corresponding n sizes and percentages for Outcome A, positive social-emotional skills.

**Table B7.1**  
**SEA Numbers for Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills**


Category	Not Improved	Improved, Not Comparable	Improved and Nearer to Peers	Improved, Comparable	Maintained	Total
N	0	148	174	160	169	651
Percent	0	22.73	26.73	24.58	25.96	100

Source: Information Management System Data Report, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).



**Figure B7.1 Percent of Children Substantially Increasing Their Rate of Growth for Positive Social-Emotional Skills (Summary Statement 1, Outcome A).** *Source. Iowa's Information Management System (IMS) FFY 2009 (2009-2010)*

Figure B7.2 illustrates the percent of preschool children with IEPs who were functioning within age expectations on Outcome A, positive social-emotional skills, for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Table B7.1 provides the corresponding n sizes and percentages for Outcome A, positive social-emotional skills.



**Figure B7.2 Percent of Children Functioning within Age Expectations for Positive Social-Emotional Skills (Summary Statement 2, Outcome A).** *Source. Iowa's Information Management System (IMS) FFY 2009 (2009-2010)*


Actual numbers used in the calculations are provided. The number of children sum to 100%, data are consistent with the measurement, and no explanation of difference or variance is required.

Figure B7.3 illustrates the percent of preschool children with IEPs who substantially increased their rate of growth on Outcome B, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Table B7.2 provides the corresponding n sizes and percentages for Outcome B, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills.

**Table B7.2**  
**SEA numbers for Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills**


Category	Not Improved	Improved, Not Comparable	Improved and Nearer to Peers	Improved, Comparable	Maintained	Total
N	0	166	292	160	33	651
Percent	0	25.50	44.85	24.58	5.07	100

*Source. Information Management System Data Report, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).*



**Figure B7.3 Percent of Children Substantially Increasing Their Rate of Growth for Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills (Summary Statement 1, Outcome B).** *Source. Iowa's Information Management System (IMS) FFY 2009 (2009-2010)*

Figure B7.4 illustrates the percent of preschool children with IEPs who were functioning within age expectations on Outcome B, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Table B7.2 provides the corresponding n sizes and percentages for Outcome B, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills.



**Figure B7.4 Percent of Children Functioning within Age Expectations for Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills (Summary Statement 2, Outcome B).** Source. Iowa's Information Management System (IMS) FFY 2009 (2009-2010)


Actual numbers used in the calculations are provided. The number of children sum to 100%, data are consistent with the measurement, and no explanation of difference or variance is required.

Figure B7.5 illustrates the percent of preschool children with IEPs who substantially increased their rate of growth on Outcome C, use of appropriate behaviors, for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Table B7.3 provides the corresponding n sizes and percentages for Outcome C, use of appropriate behaviors.

**Table B7.3**  
**SEA Numbers for Outcome C - Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

Category	Not Improved	Improved, Not Comparable	Improved and Nearer to Peers	Improved, Comparable	Maintained	Total
N	0	175	104	150	222	651
Percent	0	26.88	15.98	23.04	34.10	100


Source. Information Management System Data Report, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).



**Figure B7.5 Percent of Children Substantially Increasing Their Rate of Growth for Use of Appropriate Behaviors (Summary Statement 1, Outcome C).** *Source. Iowa's Information Management System (IMS) FFY 2009 (2009-2010)*

Figure B7.6 illustrates the percent of preschool children with IEPs who were functioning within age expectations on Outcome C, use of appropriate behaviors, for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Table B7.3 provides the corresponding n sizes and percentages for Outcome C, use of appropriate behaviors.





**Figure B7.6 Percent of Children Functioning within Age Expectations for Use of Appropriate Behaviors (Summary Statement 2, Outcome C).** Source. Iowa's Information Management System (IMS) FFY 2009 (2009-2010)


Actual numbers used in the calculations are provided. The number of children sum to 100%, data are consistent with the measurement, and no explanation of difference or variance is required.

Data were also analyzed by AEA. Figures B7.7 through B7.12 present data on all Early Childhood Outcome measures by AEA. Tables B7.4 through B7.6 show raw numbers used in the calculations by AEA.


**Table B7.4**  
**AEA Numbers for Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills**

AEA	Did Not Improve	Improved but Not Comparable	Improved and Nearer to Peers	Improved and Comparable	Maintained	Total
1	*	*	27	*	12	53
7	*	37	16	23	32	108
8	*	*	10	*	*	29
9	*	*	10	10	*	28
10	*	24	28	35	34	121
11	*	37	25	27	47	136
12	*	16	22	16	15	69
13	*	13	29	25	14	81
15	*	*	*	*	*	26
State	*	148	174	160	169	651

Source. Information Management System Data Report, FFY 2009 (2009-2010). \*Not reported due to small cell size.



**Figure B7.7 Percent of Children Substantially Increasing Their Rate of Growth for Positive Social-Emotional Skills (Summary Statement 1, Outcome A) by AEA.** Source. Iowa's Information Management System (IMS) FFY 2009 (2009-2010)



**Figure B7.8 Percent of Children Functioning within Age Expectations for Positive Social-Emotional Skills (Summary Statement 2, Outcome A) by AEA.** Source. Iowa's Information Management System (IMS) FFY 2009 (2009-2010)

Table B7.5  
AEA numbers for Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills

AEA	Did Not Improve	Improved but Not Comparable	Improved and Nearer to Peers	Improved and Comparable	Maintained	Total
1	*	*	30	12	*	53
7	*	29	39	34	*	108
8	*	*	20	*	*	29
9	*	*	13	*	*	28
10	*	24	52	40	*	121
11	*	45	51	30	10	136
12	*	21	33	12	*	69
13	*	22	42	13	*	81
15	*	*	12	*	*	26
State	*	166	292	160	33	651

Source. Information Management System Data Report, FFY 2009 (2009-2010). \*Not reported due to small cell size.





Figure B7.9 Percent of Children Substantially Increasing Their Rate of Growth for Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills (Summary Statement 1, Outcome B) by AEA. Source. Iowa's Information Management System (IMS) FFY 2009 (2009-2010)




**Figure B7.10 Percent of Children Functioning within Age Expectations for Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills (Summary Statement 2, Outcome B) by AEA.** Source. Iowa's Information Management System (IMS) FFY 2009 (2009-2010)


**Table B7.6**  
AEA Numbers for Outcome C - Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

AEA	Did Not Improve	Improved but Not Comparable	Improved and Nearer to Peers	Improved and Comparable	Maintained	Total
1	*	13	15	12	13	53
7	*	35	11	28	34	108
8	*	*	*	*	12	29
9	*	*	*	12	*	28
10	*	32	17	31	41	121
11	*	32	16	20	68	136
12	*	20	14	15	20	69
13	*	25	12	22	22	81
15	*	*	*	*	*	26
State	*	175	104	150	222	651

Source. Information Management System Data Report, FFY 2009 (2009-2010). \*Not reported due to small cell size.



**Figure B7.11 Percent of Children Substantially Increasing Their Rate of Growth for Use of Appropriate Behaviors (Summary Statement 1, Outcome C) by AEA.** Source. Iowa's Information Management System (IMS) FFY 2009 (2009-2010)



**Figure B7.12 Percent of Children Functioning within Age Expectations for Use of Appropriate Behaviors (Summary Statement 2, Outcome C) by AEA.** Source. Iowa's Information Management System (IMS) FFY 2009 (2009-2010)

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

Discussion of Improvement Activities That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Meeting targets for each indicator in the SPP is a priority for Iowa, and resources have been committed to each indicator and across indicators, to impact actual target data for each FFY on which performance is reported.

Consistent with activities documented in the SPP, several improvement activities were implemented to impact meeting the targets for this indicator. While activities have not changed, the headings used to describe each activity were changed to match the Improvement Activity headings in the APR Checklists.

Improvement activities, Measureable Outcomes, and Status/Next Steps are summarized in Table B7.7.

**Table B7.7**  
**Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

<b>Improvement Activity</b>	<b>Measurable Outcomes</b>	<b>Status/Next Steps</b>
<b>Analysis of policies, procedures and practices.</b> Develop a template for a statewide Educational Evaluation Report summarizing practices and procedures used for gathering data in the 3 ECO areas. Aligned with Indicator B11.	Child data and information is gathered on the three ECO areas through the process of completing an educational evaluation for preschool children.	Completed FFY 2009 (2009-2010)
<b>Ongoing monitoring and enforcement as needed.</b> SEA conducts onsite monitoring of LEA to verify implementation of Iowa Quality Preschool Program Standards (IQPPS) and criteria, including curriculum and child assessment.	LEA implemented IQPPS and criteria.	Through FFY 2012 (2012-2013)
<b>Verification of data.</b> SEA conducts quarterly data verification reports to ensure the accuracy of every student's ECO information.	Valid and reliable ECO data for every child entering and exiting early childhood special education services.	Through FFY 2012 (2012-2013)
<b>Verification of data.</b> Develop and provide ongoing training for AEA consultants and administrators, and data entry personnel statewide. Training includes the process of completing the ECO Summary form and correct data entry procedures.	AEA consultants and administrators were trained in ECO procedures statewide.  AEA data entry staff trained to enter valid and reliable data.	Through FFY 2012 (2012-2013)
<b>Verification of data.</b> AEA provides training sessions for IEP Teams statewide. Training targets the process of completing the ECO Summary form and correct data entry procedures.	IEP Teams trained in ECO procedures statewide.	Through FFY 2012 (2012-2013)
<b>Technical assistance.</b> Develop statewide evaluation and assessment procedures for AEA personnel.	Consistent statewide evaluation and assessment procedures for identifying children ages 3 – 21 for special education services.	Procedures manual targeted for completion July 1, 2010. Technical assistance continuing through FFY 2012 (2012-2013)
<b>Technical assistance.</b> Provide professional development to AEAs and LEAs on Iowa Quality Preschool Program Standards and implement procedures for evaluation, child assessment and curriculum.	Trained AEA and LEA personnel.	Through FFY 2012 (2012-2013)
<b>Technical assistance.</b> SEA requires LEA to implement preschool program standards in Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) and Early Childhood (EC) programs serving children on an IEP.	LEA implemented preschool program standards.	Through FFY 2012 (2012-2013)

Improvement Activity	Measurable Outcomes	Status/Next Steps
<b>Technical assistance.</b> SEA integrates ECO process into IEP statewide procedures documents and other technical assistance provided.	Consistent procedures statewide in completing the ECO Summary form; instructions for ECO process posted along with IEP procedures on DE Website.	Revisions as needed through FFY 2012 (2012-2013)
<b>Analysis of data to identify concerns.</b> SEA collaborates with Special Education Advisory Panel in analyzing progress data and setting targets for submission in February 2010.	Measureable, rigorous targets for summary statements of ECO measures.	Through FFY 2012 (2012-2013)

*Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).*

Data reported for the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) are progress data and baseline and actual target data for summary statements in each of the ECO Areas (Outcomes A, B and C). The number of children sum to 100%, data are consistent with the measurement, and no explanation of difference or variance is required. Iowa's criterion for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" is a child who has been rated as 6 or 7 on the ECO Summary form.

In FFY 2009 (2009-2010), data were available for 651 children at the time they exited ECSE services in FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Many children were still participating in ECSE services prior to the baseline year and were not reported until the current reporting year. The proportions of children in the baseline data may not have been representative of children in ECSE. This is the first year Target Data were considered representative of children participating in ECSE. The length of time the children in the data participated in ECSE services ranged from 6.05 months to 43.66 months, with an average of 20.98 months. The age range for children represented in these data ranged from 3.05 years to 5.97 years, with an average of 4.09 years. In addition, the age at entry for initial ECSE services ranged from 2.72 years to 5.47 years, with an average of 3.55 years.

**Substantially Increasing Rate of Growth (Summary Statement 1).** Analysis of State performance revealed the following in each of the three Outcome areas:

- (A) Social-Emotional Skills: Iowa was slightly below the target of 69.75% by -0.46% (69.29%).
- (B) Acquisition of Knowledge and Skills: Iowa was below the target of 77.47% by -4.33% (73.14%).
- (C) Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs: Iowa was slightly below the target of 60.17% by -0.96% (59.21%).

As shown in Figures B7.7, B7.9 and B7.11, analysis of AEA (Summary Statement 1) performance revealed the following in each of the three Outcome areas:

- (A) Social-Emotional Skills: Seven of nine AEAs met the target.
- (B) Acquisition of Knowledge and Skills: Four of nine AEAs met the target.
- (C) Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs: Four of nine AEAs met the target.

Additional analysis of the data for Substantially Increasing Rate of Growth showed that three AEAs met the State of Iowa targets in each of the three ECO areas and two AEAs met the targets in two of the three ECO areas.

**Functioning within Age Expectations (Summary Statement 2).** Analysis of State data revealed the following in each of the three Outcome areas:

- (A) Social-Emotional Skills: Iowa was below the target of 57.04% by -6.50% (50.54%).
- (B) Acquisition of Knowledge and Skills: Iowa was below the target of 38.42% by -8.77% (29.65%).

- (C) Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs: Iowa was slightly below the target of 58.48% by -1.34% (57.14%).

As shown in Figures B7.8, B7.10 and B7.12, analysis of AEA (Summary Statement 2) performance revealed the following in each of the three Outcome areas:

- (A) Social-Emotional Skills: None of the nine AEAs met the target.  
 (B) Acquisition of Knowledge and Skills: One of nine AEAs met the target.  
 (C) Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs: Two of nine AEAs met the target.

Additional analysis of the data for Functioning within Age Expectations showed that no AEAs met the State of Iowa targets in all three ECO areas or two of the three ECO areas.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010 (2010-2011):**

No new activities or revised activities are proposed for FFY 2010 (2010-2011). Targets for the remainder of the SPP have been revised as shown in the following table based on analysis of data and discussion with Iowa's Special Education Advisory Panel. The Panel determined that targets should be set to achieve 90% on all measures by 2020, and targets for the remainder of the SPP have been reset to reflect that goal.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2010 (2010-2011)</b>	<p>Outcome A, Summary Statement 1: 71.78% of children will have substantially increased their rate of growth with respect to social-emotional skills.</p> <p>Outcome A, Summary Statement 2: 60.34% of children will be functioning within age expectations with respect to social-emotional skills.</p> <p>Outcome B, Summary Statement 1: 78.72% of children will have substantially increased their rate of growth with respect to acquisition and use of knowledge and skills.</p> <p>Outcome B, Summary Statement 2: 43.58% of children will be functioning within age expectations with respect to acquisition and use of knowledge and skills.</p> <p>Outcome C, Summary Statement 1: 63.15% of children will have substantially increased their rate of growth with respect to use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>Outcome C, Summary Statement 2: 61.63% of children will be functioning within age expectations with respect to use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p>
<b>2011 (2011-2012)</b>	<p>Outcome A, Summary Statement 1: 73.80% of children will have substantially increased their rate of growth with respect to social-emotional skills.</p> <p>Outcome A, Summary Statement 2: 63.63% of children will be functioning within age expectations with respect to social-emotional skills.</p> <p>Outcome B, Summary Statement 1: 79.98% of children will have substantially</p>



	<p>increased their rate of growth with respect to acquisition and use of knowledge and skills.</p> <p>Outcome B, Summary Statement 2: 48.74% of children will be functioning within age expectations with respect to acquisition and use of knowledge and skills.</p> <p>Outcome C, Summary Statement 1: 66.14% of children will have substantially increased their rate of growth with respect to use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>Outcome C, Summary Statement 2: 64.78% of children will be functioning within age expectations with respect to use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p>
<b>2012 (2012-2013)</b>	<p>Outcome A, Summary Statement 1: 75.83% of children will have substantially increased their rate of growth with respect to social-emotional skills.</p> <p>Outcome A, Summary Statement 2: 66.93% of children will be functioning within age expectations with respect to social-emotional skills.</p> <p>Outcome B, Summary Statement 1: 81.23% of children will have substantially increased their rate of growth with respect to acquisition and use of knowledge and skills.</p> <p>Outcome B, Summary Statement 2: 53.89% of children will be functioning within age expectations with respect to acquisition and use of knowledge and skills.</p> <p>Outcome C, Summary Statement 1: 69.12% of children will have substantially increased their rate of growth with respect to use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>Outcome C, Summary Statement 2: 67.97% of children will be functioning within age expectations with respect to use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p>

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

The Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) was developed by State Education Agency (SEA) staff reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these components and comments were compiled. Parent survey data were analyzed with the following key stakeholders: Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Area Education Agency (AEA) administration, and the Iowa Department of Education staff.

In this APR the SEA will report on efforts to improve performance, improvement activities described in the State Performance Plan that were implemented in FFY 2009 (2009-2010), the outcomes of improvement activities implemented in FFY 2009 (2009-2010), and changes to improvement activities to be reported on for FFY 2010 (2010-2011).

The SEA will report to the public progress/and or slippage in meeting the “measurable and rigorous targets” found in the SPP/APR by posting on the State of Iowa Department of Education website ([http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592)) sometime after Feb 1, 2011 but no later than April 1, 2011, the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) APR submitted to OSEP. Any changes to the SPP accepted by OSEP will be posted within 30 days of receipt of the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) response letter to Iowa expected for receipt prior to July 1, 2011.

Performance of AEAs and LEAs on appropriate indicators will be posted by June 1, 2011. AEA profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590)

District profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591)

Iowa's Accountability Workbook is available at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308)

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**Indicator 8:** Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Measurement:** Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

**Measurable and Rigorous Target:**

The percent of parents reporting that schools facilitated parent involvement is a performance indicator. Therefore, each state was allowed by OSEP to set their own target from baseline data. The SEA, with input from stakeholder groups, established measurable and rigorous targets for the two subcomponents of this indicator.

For FFY 2009 (2009-2010), the measurable and rigorous targets are summarized below.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009 (2009-2010)	<p>A. 80% of parents with a child (ages three to five) receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>B. 69% of parents with a child / youth (ages 6 to 21) receiving special education services report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children / youth with disabilities.</p>

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

Data reported below are generated from Iowa's I-STAR system. These data have been determined valid and reliable based on the integrity of the sampling methodology, survey response rates and representativeness of the samples they are based upon. The actual surveys used to generate the data are included at the conclusion of Indicator B8.

States are allowed to select a sample of parents to receive the 619 and school-age surveys from which data are obtained for this indicator. As described on page two of the General Instructions, States must provide a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. The description must include: (a) the sampling procedures followed, and (b) similarity or differences of the sample to the population of students with disabilities. The description must also include how the State Education Agency addresses any problems with: (1) response rates; (2) missing data; and (3) selection bias. The sampling method used is described in detail in Iowa's SPP for Indicator 8, updated for FFY 2006, and outlined here.

In order to obtain the sample for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) a representative sample of parents of children with IEPs was drawn from each AEA proportionately by population. Sample size was determined using a 95% level of confidence with a 10% margin of error. The sample was drawn with a high level of confidence in order to ensure representativeness given an adequate response rate, and responses were later assessed for representativeness by age, race and gender (see tables B8.1 – B8.6). (Please note that Iowa does not collect information on disability category.)

In addition to the necessary sample size, an alternate sample of an additional 30% was drawn to be used, if necessary, when repeated attempts to contact the original selected parent(s) failed.

A response rate of 78.05% (626/802) for ages 3-5 and 72.84% (684/939) for ages 6-21 was achieved using the original and alternate samples together.

Survey responses that included missing answers or answers marked "not applicable" were included in the data analyses, but the missing data points were not included in either the numerator or denominator in determining the overall opinion of the respondent.

Selection bias was avoided to the largest possible extent by randomizing the selection of participants, giving the contact information of potential participants to personnel administering the survey in random order, and providing a script to personnel administering the survey. Response data were then analyzed to determine the extent to which bias based on age, race or gender were pervasive in the data (see tables B8.1 – B8.6).

Survey response data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) were assessed for similarity or difference of the sample to the population of students with disabilities. Tables B8.1, B8.2 and B8.3 present the representativeness of survey responses by age (B8.1), race/ethnicity (B8.2), and gender (B8.3) for the 619 survey (ages 3-5). Tables B8.4, B8.5 and B8.6 present analogous data for the school-aged survey (ages 6-21) with respect to age (B8.4), race/ethnicity (B8.5), and gender (B8.6).

In analyzing the data, the Iowa Department of Education interprets that the 619 survey responses (ages 3-5) are sufficiently representative of the population by age, race/ethnicity, and gender for general inferences to be made from the data. The most extreme examples of over- or under-sampling in the 619 survey are parents of five-year-olds, who were under-sampled by 6.06%, and parents of Caucasian children, who were oversampled by 3.89%.

For the school-age survey, the Iowa Department of Education interprets that the sample is sufficiently representative of the population for general inference to be made. Parents of Caucasian students were oversampled by 6.65%.

**Table B8.1**  
**Representativeness of Survey Responses by Age, 619**

<b>Age</b>			
<i>Population Percent</i>			
3	4	5	Total
24.41	33.43	42.16	100
<i>Response Percent</i>			
3	4	5	Total
27.00	36.90	36.10	100
<i>Percent Difference</i>			
3	4	5	
2.58	3.47	-6.06	

Source. Iowa's Information Management System and I-Star System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Note. N=626.

**Table B8.2**  
**Representativeness of Survey Responses by Race/Ethnicity, 619**

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>							
<i>Population Percent</i>							
Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Hispanic/Latino	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Multiple	Total
1.42	0.56	8.97	6.00	0.11	79.97	2.97	100
<i>Response Percent</i>							
Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Hispanic/Latino	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Multiple	Total
1.28	0.48	7.67	4.47	0.16	83.87	2.08	100
<i>Percent Difference</i>							
Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Hispanic/Latino	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Multiple	
-0.14	-0.08	-1.30	-1.53	0.05	3.89	-0.89	

Source. Iowa's Information Management System and I-Star System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Note N=626.

**Table B8.3**  
**Representativeness of Survey Responses by Gender, 619**

<b>Gender</b>		
<i>Population Percent</i>		
Female	Male	Total
30.60	69.40	100
<i>Response Percent</i>		
Female	Male	Total
31.79	68.21	100
<i>Percent Difference</i>		
Female	Male	
1.18	-1.18	

Source. Iowa's Information Management System and I-Star System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Note N=626.

**Table B8.4**  
**Representativeness of Survey Responses by Age, School Age**

<b>Age</b>																
<i>Population Percent</i>																
6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	Total
5.13	5.97	7.23	7.99	8.47	8.58	8.36	8.55	8.49	8.76	8.51	8.12	4.09	1.19	0.50	0.06	100
<i>Response Percent</i>																
6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	Total
5.70	8.19	7.75	7.89	8.77	7.89	8.04	8.04	8.48	9.06	9.36	6.73	2.78	0.88	0.44	0.00	100
<i>Percent Difference</i>																
6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
0.58	2.22	0.52	-0.10	0.30	-0.69	-0.32	-0.51	-0.01	0.30	0.85	-1.40	-1.31	-0.32	-0.06	-0.06	

Source. Iowa's Information Management System and I-Star System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Note. N=684.

**Table B8.5**  
**Representativeness of Survey Responses by Race/Ethnicity, School Age**

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>							
<i>Population Percent</i>							
Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Hispanic/Latino	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Multiple	Total
0.90	0.83	8.05	9.00	0.09	78.87	2.25	100
<i>Response Percent</i>							
Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Hispanic/Latino	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Multiple	Total
0.73	0.29	5.41	7.16	0.00	85.53	0.88	100
<i>Percent Difference</i>							
Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Hispanic/Latino	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Multiple	
-0.17	-0.54	-2.64	-1.84	-0.09	6.65	-1.38	

Source. Iowa's Information Management System and I-Star System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Note. N=684.

**Table B8.6**  
**Representativeness of Survey Responses by Gender, School Age**


<b>Gender</b>		
<i>Population Percent</i>		
Female	Male	Total
35.57	64.43	100
<i>Response Percent</i>		
Female	Male	Total
36.70	63.30	100
<i>Percent Difference</i>		
Female	Male	
1.13	-1.13	

Source. Iowa's Information Management System and I-Star System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Note. N=684.

Figure B8.1 presents the State baseline, measureable and rigorous targets and actual target data through FFY 2009 (2009-2010) for the percentage of parents with a child (ages three to five) receiving special education services reporting that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Target data from FFY 2008 (2008-2009) indicated that 77.70% of parents with a child (ages three to five) receiving special education services reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities, while in FFY 2009 (2009-2010) the percentage increased to 78.27.




**Figure B8.1. Trend for Percentage of Parents with a Child (ages 3 to 5) Receiving Special Education Services Reporting that Schools Facilitated Parent Involvement as a Means of Improving Services and Results for Children with Disabilities.**

Source: Iowa I-STAR System, FFY 2005 (2005-2006) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

The State of Iowa did not meet the measurable and rigorous target for measurement 8A for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) but did show improvement of 0.57% from FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Figure B8.2 presents the State baseline, measurable and rigorous targets and actual target data through FFY 2009 (2009-2010) for the percentage of parents with children/youth (ages 6 to 21) receiving special education services reporting that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

Target data from FFY 2008 (2008-2009) indicated that 71.37% of parents with children/youth (ages 6 to 21) receiving special education services reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities, while in FFY 2009 (2009-2010) the percentage decreased to 65.79.




**Figure B8.2. Trend for Percentage of Parents with Children / Youth (ages 6 to 21) Receiving Special Education Services Reporting that Schools Facilitated Parent Involvement as a Means of Improving Services and Results for Children with Disabilities.** Source. Iowa I-STAR System, FFY 2005 (2005-2006) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

The State of Iowa did not meet the measurable and rigorous target for measurement 8B for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and showed slippage of 5.58% from FFY 2008 (2008-2009).

Figure B8.3 presents the percentage of parents with a child (ages three to five) receiving special education services reporting that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities, disaggregated by AEA.






**Figure B8.3. Trend for Percentage of Parents with a Child (ages three to five) Receiving Special Education Services Reporting that Schools Facilitated Parent Involvement as a Means of Improving Services and Results for Children with Disabilities, Disaggregated at the AEA level.** *Source. Iowa I-STAR System, FFY 2008 (2008-2009) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).*

In FFY 2009 (2009-2010) 3 of 10 AEAs (30.00%) met or exceeded the State measurable and rigorous target for percentage of parents reporting facilitation of involvement for children ages 3-5.

Figure B8.4 presents the percentage of parents with children / youth (ages 6 to 21) receiving special education services reporting that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities, disaggregated by AEA.



**Figure B8.4. Trend for Percentage of Parents with Children / Youth (ages 6 to 21) Receiving Special Education Services Reporting that Schools Facilitated Parent Involvement as a Means of Improving Services and Results for Children with Disabilities, Disaggregated at the AEA level.** Source. Iowa I-STAR System, FFY 2005 (2005-2006) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

In FFY 2009 (2009-2010) 3 of 10 AEAs (30.00%) met or exceeded the State measurable and rigorous target for percentage of parents reporting facilitation of involvement for school-age children.

Table B8.7 presents the actual numbers used in calculating the percentages for the 619 survey by AEA for the State. Table B8.8 presents analogous information for the school-age survey.

Data are consistent with measurement, and no explanation of variance is required.

**Table B8.7**  
**Number and Percent of Survey Responses, 619, by AEA and State**

AEA	1	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	State
N Agree	35	49	48	44	73	58	65	48	21	49	490
N Response	45	66	61	60	85	63	77	61	27	81	626
Percent	77.78	74.24	78.69	73.33	85.88	92.06	84.42	78.69	77.78	60.49	78.27

Source. Iowa's Information Management System and I-Star System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

**Table B8.8**  
**Number and Percent of Survey Responses, School-Age, by AEA and State**

AEA	1	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	State
N Agree	48	36	45	37	68	38	67	36	25	50	450
N Response	70	59	77	60	86	57	93	55	33	94	684
Percent	68.57	61.02	58.44	61.67	79.07	66.67	72.04	65.45	75.76	53.19	65.79

Source. Iowa's Information Management System and I-Star System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):

Discussion of Improvement Activities That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Meeting targets for each indicator in the SPP is a priority for Iowa, and resources have been committed to each indicator and across indicators, to impact actual target data for each FFY on which performance is reported.

Consistent with activities documented in the SPP, several improvement activities were implemented to impact meeting the targets for this indicator. While activities have not changed, the headings used to describe each activity were changed to match the Improvement Activity headings in the APR Checklists.

Improvement Activities, Measureable Outcomes, and Status/Next Steps are summarized in Table B8.9.

**Table B8.9**  
**Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

Improvement Activity	Measurable Outcomes	Status/Next Steps
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> The SEA facilitated meetings with Parent-Educator Connection Coordinators to promote consistent practices across the state to support family-educator partnerships in schools and AEAs.	Parents and educators partnered to support success of students with IEPs in school. Parents reported greater levels of agreement for Indicator B8.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> The SEA distributed and prepared for the implementation of the NCSEAM guide: Improving Relationships and Results: Building Family School Partnerships	Trainings were held beginning in FFY 2008 (2008-2009) and continuing through FFY 2009 (2009-2010). All AEAs had at least one training with LEAs by June 30, 2009.	Ongoing through FFY 2009 (2009-2010)
<b>Evaluation.</b> The SEA revised requirements for submission of year end reports from PEC Coordinators to include documentation of interaction with parents.	The SEA has the following information on activities conducted, number of people contacted/impacted, and the effect on Indicator B8:	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> SEA will facilitate meetings with Parent-Educator Connection Coordinators to promote consistent practices across the state to support family-educator partnerships in schools and AEAs.	Activities with PEC completed during 2009-2010: 8 teleconferences with PEC staff providing information and research that supports parents of children with disabilities who have IEPs; 2- two day meetings with PEC staff covering training topics they identify as a group as needing.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)

Improvement Activity	Measurable Outcomes	Status/Next Steps
	2009-2010 parent survey results for each AEA	
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> SEA will distribute and prepare for the implementation of the NCSEAM guide: Improving Relationships and Results: Building Family School Partnerships	Ten out of ten AEAs offered trainings for parents, educators, students and community providers.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Evaluation.</b> SEA will revise requirements for submission of year end reports from PEC Coordinators to include documentation of interaction with parents.	8 of 10 PEC programs in the AEAs reporting  Contacts: Of the 23,684 contacts through the PEC, 5303 were from families PECs Attended the following IFSP meetings: 205 IEP meetings: 494 BAT/504 meetings 83 Pre/Post Meeting visits: 448 Parents attending trainings: 1031	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)

Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

The State of Iowa did not meet the target for the percent of parents (children 3 to 5) reporting that the school facilitated involvement for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) but showed improvement from FFY 2008 (2008-2009) of 0.57%. The SEA attributes this improvement to ongoing efforts with the teams of Early Childhood special education staff and families working together. Particular attention is paid to getting information to families in a timely manner and connecting them to other resources helpful to families and children with disabilities.

The State of Iowa did not meet the target for the percent of parents (children 6 to 21) reporting that the school facilitated involvement and showed slippage of 5.58% from FFY 2008 (2008-2009) to FFY 2009 (2009-2010). The SEA is uncertain of the cause of this slippage in the data. Prior to seeing the data, SEA staff predicted there would be an increase in the percentage. Ongoing work during the course of the current year will be directed toward increasing the data for the school-age population for FFY 2010 (2010-2011).

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010 (2010-2011):**

Proposed activities for FFY 2010 (2010-2011) are discussed in Table B8.10. These activities are consistent with what was proposed in the FFY 2004 (2004-2011) State Performance Plan and describe activities to be implemented in FFY 2010 (2010-2011) that will allow Iowa to meet measureable and rigorous targets for both FFY 2010 (2010-2011) and the targets continuing in the SPP through FFY 2012 (2012-2013).

(Note: Activities listed as ongoing in Table B8.9 will continue in FFY 2010 (2010-2011), and are not listed in Table B8.10).

**Table B8.10**  
**Proposed Activities for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**

Proposed Activity	Proposed Personnel Resources	Proposed Timelines	Anticipated Outcomes
Evaluation. SEA and AEA/PEC staff will design a new survey method to gather the parent survey for next 5 year state plan.	SEA workgroup PEC Staff	2010-2011	Development of a reliable, effective data collection process to survey a larger sample of parents in order for districts to data they may use. The parent survey data shall be designed so data may be entered into the existing I-STAR system.

## 2009-2010 Parent Survey - Preschool Special Education

<b>Survey Code Number</b>		
<b>Completed:</b>		
<b>Interviewer</b>		
<b>*Student Name:</b>		
<i>First</i>	<i>Last</i>	
<b>*Parent Name:</b>		
<i>First</i>	<i>Last</i>	
<b>Mailing address</b>		
<i>Street, City, State and ZIP</i>		
<b>*Attending district:</b>		
<b>Phone Number:</b>	<b>Alternate number:</b>	
<i>Include area code</i>	<i>Include area code</i>	
<b>Email address1</b>	<b>Email2</b>	
<b>Attempt dates:</b>		
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Preferred date and time to call back</b>		
<b>Notes:</b>		
<b>Entered into web system</b>	<b>By</b>	
<b>Entered into computer</b>		
<b>Data Entry person</b>	<b>Refused survey:</b>	

*This is a survey for parents of children receiving preschool special education services. Your responses will help guide efforts to improve services and results for children and families. For each statement below, please select one of the following response choices: very strongly disagree, strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree, very strongly agree. In responding to each statement, think about your experience and your child's experience with preschool special education over the past year. You may skip any item that you feel does not apply to you or your child.*

Preschool Special Education Partnership Efforts and Quality of Services								
	Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly disagree	N/A	Don't Know
1. I am part of the IEP/IFSP decision-making process.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. My recommendations are included on the IEP/IFSP.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. My child's IEP/IFSP goals are written in a way that I can work on them at home during daily routines.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. My child's evaluation report was written using words I understand.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The preschool special education program involves parents in evaluations of whether preschool special education is effective.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. I have been asked for my opinion about how well preschool special education services are meeting my child's needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Preschool Special Education Partnership Efforts and Quality of Services								
	Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly disagree	N/A	Don't Know
<i>People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers:</i>								
7. -provide me with information on how to get other services (e.g., childcare, parent support, respite, regular preschool program, WIC, food stamps).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. -are available to speak with me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. - treat me as an equal team member.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. - encourage me to participate in the decision-making process.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. -respect my culture.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. -value my ideas.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. -ensure that I have fully understood my rights related to preschool special education.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. -communicate regularly with me regarding my child's progress on IEP/IFSP goals.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. -give me options concerning my child's services and supports.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. -provide me with strategies to deal with my child's behavior.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. -give me enough information to know if my child is making progress.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. -give me information about the approaches they use to help my child learn.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. -give me information about organizations that offer support for parents (for example, Parent Training and Information Centers, Family Resource Centers,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. -offer parents training about preschool special education.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

21. -offer parents different ways of communicating with people from preschool special education (e.g., face-to-face meetings, phone calls, e-mail).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. -explain what options parents have if they disagree with a decision made by the preschool special education program.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Preschool Special Education Partnership Efforts and Quality of Services								
	Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly disagree	N/A	Don't Know
<i>People from preschool special education, including teachers and other service providers:</i>								
23. -give parents the help they may need, such as transportation, to play an active role in their child's learning and development.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24. -offer supports for parents to participate in training workshops.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25. -connect families with one another for mutual support.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

\*As of today, how old is your child?

Options are:

under 3;

between 3-4;

Between 4-5;

5 and older

Thank you very much for your input.

## 2009-2010 Parent Survey – K-12 Special Education

Survey Code Number	
Completed:	
Interviewer	
*Student Name:	
First	Last
*Parent Name:	
First	Last
Mailing address Street, City, State and ZIP	
*Attending district:	
Phone Numbers: Include area code	Alternate number: Include area code
Email address1	Email2
Attempt dates:	
1	2
3	
Preferred date and time to call back	
Notes:	
Entered into web system by	
Refused survey	

This is a survey for parents of students receiving special education services. Your responses will help guide efforts to improve services and results for children and families. For each statement below, please select one of the following response choices: very strongly disagree, strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree, very strongly agree. **You may skip any item that you feel does not apply to you or your child.**

		Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly disagree	N/A	Don't Know
<b>Schools efforts to partner with parents</b>									
1.	I am considered an equal partner with teachers and other professionals in planning my child's program.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	I was offered special assistance (such as child care) so that I could participate in the Individualized Educational Program (IEP) meeting.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.	At the IEP meeting, we discussed how my child would participate in statewide assessments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.	At the IEP meeting, we discussed accommodations and modifications that my child would need.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.	All of my concerns and recommendations were documented on the IEP.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



6.	Written justification was given for the extent that my child would not receive services in the regular classroom.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.	I was given information about organizations that offer support for parents of students with disabilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.	I have been asked for my opinion about how well special education services are meeting my child's needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly disagree	N/A	Don't Know
9.	My child's evaluation report is written in terms I understand.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10.	Written information I receive is written in an understandable way.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11.	Teachers are available to speak with me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12.	Teachers treat me as a team member	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Teachers and administrators</b>									
13.	-seek out parent input.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14.	-show sensitivity to the needs of students with disabilities and their families.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15.	-encourage me to participate in the decision-making process.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.	-respect my cultural heritage.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17.	-ensure that I have fully understood the Procedural Safeguards [the rules in federal law that protect the rights of parents]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>The school:</b>									
18.	- has a person on staff who is available to answer parents' questions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19.	- communicates regularly with me regarding my child's progress on IEP goals.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20.	- gives me choices with regard to services that address my child's needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21.	- offers parents training about special education issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

22.	- offers parents a variety of ways to communicate with teachers.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23.	- gives parents the help they may need to play an active role in their child's education.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24.	- provides information on agencies that can assist my child in the transition from school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25.	- explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>*As of today, how old is your child?</b></p> <p><b>*In what grade is your child? Options – K-12</b></p> <p><b>*At what age did your child begin to receive Early ACCESS or special education services?</b>  Under 1; birth – age 2; Age 3-5; Age 6-8; Age 9-12; Age 13-17; Age 18+</p>									
Thank you very much for your input.					Do you have any other comments your wish to provide to the program?				

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

The Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) was developed by SEA staff reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities, and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included the State Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), the Area Education Agencies (AEA) administration, and the Iowa Department of Education staff.

In the FFY 2008 (2008-2009) Response Letter to Iowa, OSEP analyzed Iowa's data for Indicator 9 from FFY 2008 (2008-2009) and stated that Iowa's efforts with respect to this indicator are appreciated. Hence, Iowa will continue to report on the measurement and results of improvement activities for Indicator 9 for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

The SEA will report to the public progress/and or slippage in meeting the "measurable and rigorous targets" found in the SPP/APR by posting on the State of Iowa Department of Education website ([http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592)) sometime after Feb 1, 2011 but no later than April 1, 2011, the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) APR submitted to OSEP. Any changes to the SPP accepted by OSEP will be posted within 30 days of receipt of the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) response letter to Iowa expected for receipt prior to July 1, 2011.

Performance of AEAs and LEAs on appropriate indicators will be posted by June 1, 2011. AEA profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590). District profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591). Iowa's Accountability Workbook is available at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308).

**Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality**

**Indicator 9:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

AEAs are the subrecipients of Part B funds in the state of Iowa and are considered Iowa's LEAs for the purposes of reporting in the SPP and APR, as reflected in Iowa's State Eligibility Document on file with OSEP. In addition, because Iowa's Area Education Agencies carry primary responsibility for conducting child-find activities, data for Indicator 9 were examined at the AEA level.

The paragraphs that follow summarize Iowa's (a) definition of Disproportionate Representation, (b) measurement strategy for determining disproportionate representation, (c) *n* size used for calculations, and (d) process for determining if Disproportionate Representation was a result of Inappropriate Identification.

*State Definition of Disproportionate Representation.* Consistent with the “Disproportionality: Discussion of SPP/APR Response Table Language” (North Central Regional Resource Center), in response to the OSEP Analysis/Next Steps in the Iowa Part B FFY 2005 SPP/APR Response Table, and in accordance with 34 CFR § 300.600 (d) (3), the Iowa defines “disproportionate representation” as occurring when one or more of the following statements are true, for any of the seven races or ethnicities examined:

- A. Overrepresentation occurs when the weighted risk ratio or alternate risk ratio is greater than 2.00.
- B. Underrepresentation occurs when the weighted risk ratio or alternate risk ratio is less than 0.25.

*Measurement of Disproportionate Representation.* In FFY 2006 (2006-2007) Iowa changed calculations used to determine disproportionate representation from the composition index to a weighted risk ratio.

Risk ratios are preferable to the composition index because the size of a risk ratio is not dependent upon the composition of the state or district’s total enrollment. In addition, the size of a risk ratio is not dependent on differences in overall special education identification rates. Weighted risk ratios, therefore, can be directly compared across districts and ranked in order to target assistance efforts. The large number of small schools in Iowa with low ethnic enrollment make the weighted risk ratio a more appropriate measurement strategy than a composition index or unweighted risk ratio for disproportionate representation.

The race/ethnicity categories used for analysis were: African American, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander, Caucasian, and Multiple Races. The formula for the weighted risk ratio is:

$$\text{Weighted risk ratio} = \frac{R_i}{\sum_{j \neq i} w_j R_j} = \frac{(1-p_i) R_i}{\sum_{j \neq i} p_j R_j}$$

where  $R_i$  is the district-level risk for racial/ethnic group  $i$ , and  $p_i$  is the state-level proportion of students from racial/ethnic group  $i$ .  $R_j$  is the district-level risk for the  $j$ -th racial/ethnic group, and  $p_j$  is the state-level proportion of students from the  $j$ -th racial/ethnic group.

An alternate risk ratio is calculated if there are at least ten students with IEPs in the ethnic group of interest, but fewer than ten students with IEPs in the comparison group. The alternate risk ratio is calculated by modifying the above equation so that the district-level risk for the racial/ethnic group ( $R_i$ ) is divided by the state-level risk for all other students.

*Cell Sizes for Calculating Disproportionate Representation.* Because of the large number of schools in Iowa with low ethnic enrollment, the cell size used for calculating weighted risk ratio and the alternate risk ratio was set at 10. Iowa believes this “ $n$ ” is statistically appropriate given the composition of schools in Iowa.

*Determining if Disproportionate Representation is Due to Inappropriate Practices.*

Iowa has developed a Disproportionality Review that is conducted at the AEA level. The process involves a formal review in which the AEA examines and evaluates the following areas:

- Section 1: Review of Data,
- Section 2: Review of Related Issues and Practices,
- Section 3: Review of Policies, Procedures and Practices,
- Section 4: Technical Assistance/Professional Development, and
- Section 5: Results/Findings

The data review consists of the AEA examining its collection and use of data, (e.g., how data are disaggregated, analyzed, used to make decisions, guide practices, etc.). The review of related issues and practices consists of the examination of key areas that have been identified as impacting the area of disproportionality (e.g., utilization of universal screening; administrator/personnel understanding of special

education procedures and requirements regarding referral, evaluation, identification, placement, discipline, LRE; attempts to rule out exclusionary factors during the evaluation process, etc.)

The process also consists of a formal review of policies, procedures and practices regarding the following areas: child find, parent participation, general education interventions, systematic problem-solving process, progress monitoring and data collection, determination of eligibility and evaluations/reevaluations. In addition, the AEA describes the technical assistance and/or professional development that is being conducted at the AEA and in districts regarding and/or related to disproportionality (e.g., differentiation of instruction, progress monitoring, cultural competency, understanding racial biases, etc.).

The AEAs submit the completed review document and findings to the SEA. A team of consultants meet to review and discuss the results and findings. A final determination of whether or not disproportionality is a result of inappropriate identification is made by the SEA.

AEAs identified with noncompliance work in collaboration with the SEA in developing a corrective action plan. Areas of noncompliance are to be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification.

#### Measurable and Rigorous Target:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009 (2009-2010)	0% of districts have a disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification

#### Actual Target Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):

Data analyzed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) are the same data reported to OSEP for Iowa's 618 Table 1: Report of Children With Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of the IDEA for 2009-2010. The actual numbers used in the calculations are summarized in Table B9.1.

**Table B9.1**  
**Raw Numbers Used to Generate Calculations, FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

	African-American	Hispanic	Asian	Native-American	Pacific Islander	Caucasian	Multi-racial	Total
<b>AEA 1</b>	231	120	21	18	*	3670	80	4145
<b>AEA 267</b>	889	762	57	95	10	7161	205	9179
<b>AEA 8</b>	134	359	42	20	*	3124	61	3744
<b>AEA 9</b>	750	607	33	50	*	4021	147	5614
<b>AEA 10</b>	1249	402	94	50	*	6252	84	8136
<b>AEA 11</b>	1649	1402	188	77	12	10586	497	14411
<b>AEA 12</b>	174	710	49	122	*	3410	108	4577
<b>AEA 13</b>	82	182	19	31	*	3584	59	3960
<b>AEA 14</b>	17	68	*	*	*	1335	15	1455
<b>AEA 15</b>	258	247	32	30	*	4472	104	5148
<b>State of Iowa</b>	5433	4859	544	502	56	47615	1360	60369

Source: Iowa 618 Table 1, FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and Iowa Project EASIER FFY 2009 (2009-2010). \*Data not reportable due to small cell size.

Table B9.1 shows AEAs and race/ethnicity groups where Iowa's cell size requirement of ten resulted in no calculation of a weighted or alternate risk ratio, as indicated by an asterisk. AEA 14 had the most instances of this.

Table B9.2 summarizes AEA-level data for disproportionate representation, for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Categories of disproportionate representation, based on Iowa's definition of over- and under-representation, are highlighted.

**Table B9.2**  
**Weighted-risk Ratio (or Alternate Risk Ratio) for AEA and State, by Subgroup, FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

	Exceeds Iowa's threshold for overrepresentation of a weighted or alternate risk ratio greater than 2.00
	Exceeds Iowa's threshold of for underrepresentation of a weighted or alternate risk ratio less than 0.25

	African-American	Hispanic	Asian	Native-American	Pacific Islander	Caucasian	Multi-racial
<b>AEA 1</b>	1.91	1.04	0.56	1.57	NA	0.75	1.43
<b>AEA 267</b>	1.75	1.03	0.57	1.66	0.89	0.80	1.14
<b>AEA 8</b>	1.89	1.03	0.68	1.56	NA	0.78	0.99
<b>AEA 9</b>	1.75	0.97	0.35	1.95	NA	0.85	1.03
<b>AEA 10</b>	2.02	1.24	0.41	1.76	NA	0.68	1.25
<b>AEA 11</b>	2.05	1.16	0.42	1.71	0.89	0.71	1.22
<b>AEA 12</b>	1.62	0.95	0.54	1.59	NA	0.85	1.35
<b>AEA 13</b>	1.31	0.76	0.69	1.46	NA	1.03	1.13
<b>AEA 14</b>	1.94	0.78	NA	NA	NA	0.87	0.73
<b>AEA 15</b>	1.67	0.88	0.61	1.24	NA	0.91	0.91
<b>State of Iowa</b>	1.84	1.01	0.46	1.63	0.80	0.80	1.13

WRR = Weighted Risk Ratio

ALT = Alternate Risk Ratio

Source: Iowa Project EASIER, FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and Iowa Information Management System FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

For FFY 2009 (2009-2010), 2 of 10 AEAs had disproportionate representation, meaning that two AEAs met or exceeded the criteria for under- or over-representation. Both AEAs were required to engage in reviews of policies, procedures, and practices to determine if disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

*Summary of Process Used to Determine if Disproportionality was Due to Inappropriate Practice.*

**State Policy.** The State of Iowa has policies and procedures designed to prevent inappropriate overidentification or disproportionate representation by race and ethnicity of children with disabilities, consistent with 34 CFR § 300.8, 20 U. S. C. 1418 (d), 20 U. S. C 1412 (a) (24), 34 CFR § 300.173. The State of Iowa and has procedures requiring use of a variety of assessment tools and strategies to gather

relevant functional, developmental, and academic information, including information provided by the parent, that may assist in determining whether the child is a child with a disability, and the content of the child's IEP, consistent with 20 U. S. C. 1414 (b) (2); 34 CFR § 300.304 (b). The State of Iowa has policies ensuring that assessments and other evaluation materials used to assess a child under 20 U. S. C. 1414 (b) are selected and administered so as not to be discriminatory on a racial or cultural basis, are provided and administered in the language and form most likely to yield accurate information on what the child knows and can do academically, developmentally, and functionally, and other requirements for assessment in all areas of suspected disability, by trained and knowledgeable personnel (20 U. S. C. 1414 (b) (3)); 34 CFR § 300.304 (c). The State of Iowa has policies that determination that the child has a disability and the educational needs of the child shall be made by a group of qualified professionals and the parent, in accordance with § 300.306 (b), 20 U. S. C. 1414 (b) (4), 34 CFR § 300.306 (a). The State of Iowa has policies that, in making a determination of eligibility, a child shall not be determined to be a child with a disability if the determinant factor for such determination is: lack of appropriate instruction in reading, including the essential components of reading instruction (as defined in Section 1208 (3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965); lack of appropriate instruction in math; or limited English proficiency; or if the child does not otherwise meet the eligibility criteria under 34 CFR § 300.8 (a) [20 U. S. C. 1414 (b) (5); 34 CFR § 300.306 (b)]. The State of Iowa has policies that, in interpreting evaluation data for the purpose of determining if a child is a child with a disability under § 300.8, and the educational needs of the child, each public agency must draw upon information from a variety of sources, and ensure that information from all these sources is documented and carefully considered [20 U. S. C. 1414 (c); 34 CFR § 300.306 (c)].


*Result of Review of Policies, procedures, and Practices.*

Findings of the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) disproportionality review resulted in 1 out of 2 AEAs having disproportionate overrepresentation of a racial/ethnic subgroup in special education due to inappropriate identification. The AEA had 4 findings of noncompliance relating to 34 CFR 300.304 – 300.306 as described in the table below.

Code of Federal Regulations	Area of noncompliance
34 CFR § 300.304 – 300.306	(1) General education activities are documented and include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Measureable and goal-directed attempts to resolve the presenting problem or behaviors of concern,</li> <li>ii) Communication with parents</li> <li>iii) Collection of data related to the presenting problem or behaviors of concern,</li> <li>iv) Intervention design and implementation, and systematic progress monitoring to measure effects of interventions</li> </ul>
34 CFR § 300.304 – 300.306	(2) At a minimum, the systematic problem-solving process includes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Description of the problem</li> <li>b) Data collection and problem analysis</li> <li>c) Intervention design and implementation</li> <li>d) Progress monitoring</li> <li>e) Evaluation of intervention effects</li> </ul>
34 CFR § 300.304 – 300.306	(3) The public agency has established standards by which the adequacy of general education instruction, including the quality and quantity of data gathered, is assessed, and whether such data are sufficient in quantity and quality to make decisions.
34 CFR § 300.306(b)	(4) A child must not be determined to be a child with a disability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If the determinate factor is:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Lack of appropriate instruction in reading, including the essential components of reading instruction;</li> <li>(2) Lack of appropriate instruction in math</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

A correction action plan will be developed and areas of noncompliance will be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification.

Figure B9.1 summarizes the percentage of AEAs with disproportionate over or underidentification, and the percentage of AEAs with disproportionate representation due to inappropriate practices for FFY 2005 (2005-2006) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).



**Figure B9.1. Percent of AEAs with Disproportionate Over- and Under-Representation of Racial or Ethnic Subgroups in Special Education, and Percent of Disproportionate Representation Due to Inappropriate Practices.** *Source.* Iowa Information Management System and Iowa Project EASIER, FFY 2005 (2005-2006) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

For FFY 2009 (2009-2010), Iowa did not meet the measurable and rigorous target for Indicator 9. One AEA had disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification.

#### **Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed in FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Meeting targets for each indicator in the SPP is a priority for Iowa, and resources have been committed to each indicator and across indicators, to impact actual target data for each FFY on which performance is reported.

Consistent with activities documented in the SPP, several improvement activities were implemented to impact meeting the targets for this indicator. While activities have not changed, the headings used to describe each activity were changed to match the Improvement Activity headings in the APR Checklists.

Improvement activities, Measureable Outcomes, and Status/Next Steps are summarized in Table B9.3.



**Table B9.3**  
**Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

<b>Improvement Activity</b>	<b>Measurable Outcomes</b>	<b>Status/Next Steps</b>
<b>Improve data collection and reporting.</b> Data were verified within IMS system.	Continued accuracy of disproportionality data.	Ongoing for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and annually through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> Study professional literature to determine factors associated with disproportionality and factors associated with inappropriate identification practices	Relevant articles from TA centers were reviewed. Understanding that disproportionality is a problem that needs attention was communicated to AEAs and to some LEAs. Policies and practices around root cause analysis were not identified in the professional literature.	Ongoing for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and annually through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> The SEA supported one AEA in providing training to AEA staff on evaluating exclusionary factors in Child Find, and in supporting districts through instructional consultation.	Effect of exclusionary factors on performance is more fully described in Evaluation reports.  Districts use data to examine how instructional resources are provided to subgroups of students.  An institute on disproportionality for school staff is in the process of being developed.	Ongoing for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and annually through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Improve Systems Administration and Monitoring.</b> SEA developed and implemented a new review protocol for AEAs demonstrating disproportionate representation.	AEAs have a process to guide/assist them in the review of policies, procedures and practices that will result in identifying potential root causes of disproportionality.	Implemented Fall 2010 and ongoing through 2011.

*Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).* The analyses of data form the basis of discussion that follows.

Iowa did not meet the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) measurable and rigorous target for percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification, with 10% (1 of 10) of AEAs found to have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate practices. This represents slippage from FFY 2008 (2008-2009), which the SEA attributes primarily to the use of a more sophisticated self-assessment tool. In addition, the special education staff at the AEA conducted a valid and meaningful assessment of disproportionate representation in the AEA.

**Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (if State did not report 0%):**Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2008 for this indicator: 0 %

7. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009)	0
8. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	NA
9. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

**Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):**

10. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
11. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	NA
12. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

**Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected:**

While there were no outstanding findings of individual noncompliance from FFY 2008 (2008-2009), the state has procedures in place should timely correction not take place in the future. Iowa's Administrative Rules of Special Education provide the SEA with the latitude to take enforcement actions in cases of noncompliance with the IDEA, including, but not limited to, requiring a corrective action plan, withholding payments under Part B, and referring the matter for enforcement to the department of justice or state auditor. [IAC 281-41.604]

In FFY 2008 (2008-2009), an analysis of weighted risk-ratio, risk gap, and alternate risk-ratio, was conducted to determine where disproportionate representation occurred.

When thresholds for disproportionate over- and under-identification were breached, policies, procedures, and practices were reviewed to determine if disproportionate representation was due to inappropriate identification.

For Indicator 9, there were no corrective actions needed for FFY 2008 (2008-2009). Hence, the state did not take enforcement actions.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010 (2010-2011):**

Proposed activities for FFY 2010 (2010-2011) are discussed in Table B9.4. These activities are consistent with what was proposed in the FFY 2004 (2004-2011) State Performance Plan and describe activities to be implemented in FFY 2010 (2010-2011) that will allow Iowa to meet measureable and rigorous targets for both FFY 2010 (2010-2011) and the targets continuing in the SPP through FFY 2012 (2012-2013).

(Note: Activities listed as ongoing in Table B9.3 will continue in FFY 2010 (2010-2011), and are not listed in Table B9.4).

**Table B9.4**  
**Proposed Activities for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**

Proposed Activity	Proposed Personnel Resources	Proposed Timelines	Anticipated Outcomes
<b>Improve systems administration and monitoring and provide technical assistance.</b> The SEA will meet individually with AEAs that have been identified as having disproportionate representation to review and provided technical assistance regarding newly developed review protocols.	1 SEA staff 6-10 AEA staff	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	Development of a standardized review protocol and procedures for the monitoring of B9.
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> The SEA will contract with a national technical assistance center and/or state to provide technical assistance to AEAs and districts regarding disproportionality and “what works”.	1-2 SEA staff 1-3 National Experts	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)	Increase AEAs and districts ability to analyze and identify root causes of disproportionality and develop continuous improvement activities to address identified areas of concern.

#### References

- Gamm, S. (2008). *Disproportionality in Special Education: Where and Why Overidentification of Minority Students Occurs*. LRP Publications.
- Kozleski, E. B., & Zion, S. (2006). *Preventing Disproportionality by Strengthening District Policies and Procedures – An Assessment and Strategic Planning Process*. Downloaded August 1, 2008 from [www.nccrest.org](http://www.nccrest.org).

## **IOWA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**



### **Area Educational Agency Disproportionality Review**

*FFY09 Data  
(2010-2011 School Year)*

### **Area Educational Agency Disproportionality Review**

The 2004 amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and the IDEA's 2006 implementing regulations require the Iowa Department of Education to gather data to determine whether disproportionate representation of a race or ethnic group in special education and related services exists that is the result of inappropriate identification in Iowa's Local Education Agencies (LEAs).

Area Educational Agencies (AEAs) are the sub-recipients of Part B funds in the state of Iowa and are considered Iowa's LEAs for the purposes of reporting in the State Performance Plan (SPP) and the Annual Performance Report (APR). In addition, because Iowa's AEAs carry primary responsibility for conducting child-find activities, data for Disproportionate Representation (Indicator 9 of the SPP) are examined at the AEA level. If an AEA has disproportionate representation of a race or ethnic group in special education, the Department requires the district to take certain actions required by the IDEA.

This document is to serve as a tool for the review of Area Educational Agencies (AEAs) in the state of Iowa that have been determined to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification policies, procedures and/or practices as set forth in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEIA '04) in the following paragraph:

**281-41.173(256B,34CFR300) Overidentification and disproportionality.** Each public agency shall implement policies and procedures developed by the department designed to prevent the inappropriate overidentification or disproportionate representation by race and ethnicity of children as children with disabilities, including children with disabilities with a particular impairment.

## INSTRUCTIONS

**NOTE:** *It is suggested that the AEA form a disproportionality committee to conduct and/or oversee the review process*

---

### STEP 1:

Fill out the Reviewer Information Sheet and the following sections:

Section 1: *Review of Data*

Section 2: *Review of Related Issues and Practices*

Section 3: *Review of Policies, Procedures and Practices*

Section 4: *Technical Assistance/Professional Development*

Section 5: *Results/Findings Form*

If applicable, attach revisions of any policies, procedures or practices.

---

### STEP 4:

- Complete **Statement of Assurance**
- 

### STEP 5:

- Mail a completed copy of the entire document and required attachments to the Iowa Department of Education at the following address:

**Cheryl Merical, Consultant  
Bureau of Student and Family Support  
Services  
Iowa Department of Education  
400 E. 14<sup>th</sup> Street  
Des Moines, IA 50319**

---

**CONTACT INFORMATION:** If you have any questions please contact Cheryl Merical at [Cheryl.merical@iowa.gov](mailto:Cheryl.merical@iowa.gov) or 515.868.2454.

---

## REVIEWER INFORMATION SHEET

AEA \_\_\_\_\_  
Date Completed \_\_\_\_\_

Contact/Lead Person \_\_\_\_\_ Position \_\_\_\_\_  
E-mail \_\_\_\_\_ Ph# \_\_\_\_\_

*List all individuals involved in the completion of this review.*

Name	Position	Sections Reviewed

**SECTION 1****DATA REVIEW**

<b>Section 1A: Review of Data Collection and Use Of Data</b>	
1. Describe how the AEA collects and analyzes data on students with disabilities (include both at the AEA level and at the district level). Who is responsible for the general supervision of this activity?	
2. Describe how disaggregated data is routinely shared and analyzed among both AEA staff and district leadership teams.	

<b>Section 1B: Review of Data AEA/District Level Data</b>	<b>Yes or No</b>
1. If the national average for students with disabilities is about 12% - 13% is your AEA's overall classification rate within this range?	<b>Yes    No</b>



2. Does the AEA have a hypothesis for having significant disproportionality? Please describe.	<b>Yes    No</b>
3. Are there certain districts that the overall identification rate of <u>ALL</u> students with an IEP is of concern (e.g., too high or too low)?  If yes, list those districts.	<b>Yes    No</b>
4. Are there certain districts that the identification rate of students with an IEP of certain <u>racial/ethnic</u> group is of concern (e.g., too high or too low)?  If so, list those districts.	<b>Yes    No</b>
5. Are there student enrollment trends or demographics that need to be further investigated by disaggregating data by race/ethnicity and for students with an IEP for any district (e.g., transfer students, drop-out rates, graduation rates, etc.?)  If yes, describe.	<b>Yes    No</b>

**SECTION 2****RELATED ISSUES AND PRACTICES REVIEW**

This section assists the AEA in a review of related issues and practices that have been identified as key areas in addressing disproportionality.

<b>Section 2: Related Issues and Practices</b>
1. In the districts served by the AEA, describe what type of universal screening data (DIBELS, CBM, PBIS, etc.) is used at each school to identify students who may be academically or behaviorally at risk?
4. How does AEA ensure that AEA staff and district administrators and staff understand district special education procedures and requirements regarding referral, evaluation, identification, placement, discipline and the student's right to be educated in the least restrictive environment?
6. Describe how the AEA ensures rigorous attempts to rule out <u>exclusionary factors</u> and instructional deficiencies as predominant factors before progressing with a determination of eligibility. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Visual, hearing or motor disability</li><li>• Mental disability</li><li>• Emotional disturbance</li><li>• Cultural factors</li><li>• Environmental or economic disadvantage</li><li>• Limited English proficiency</li><li>• Determination that appropriate instruction has been delivered by qualified personnel</li><li>• Determination that data-based assessments were conducted at reasonable intervals?</li></ul>

## SECTION 3

## POLICIES PROCEDURES AND PRACTICE REVIEW

Are the district's policies, procedures and practices in compliance with federal and state law and regulations?	Policy	Procedure	Practice
Item			
<b>Focus Area – Child Find</b>			
1) All children with disabilities who are in need of special education and related services are identified, located and evaluated [IAC 281-41.111].	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
<b>Focus Area - Parent Participation</b>			
1) The identification process includes interactions with the individual, the individual's parents, school personnel, and others having specific responsibilities for or knowledge of the individual. AEA and district personnel shall seek active parent participation throughout the process, directly communicate with parents, and encourage parents to participate at all decision points [IAC 281-41.300(5)].	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
2) Prior notice (written notice) is provided in the native language or other mode of communication used by the parent, unless it is clearly not feasible to do so [IAC 281-41.503(3)].	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
3) The district takes whatever action is necessary to ensure that the parent understands the proceedings of the IEP team meeting, including arranging for an interpreter for parents with deafness or whose native language is other than English [IAC 281-41.322(5)].	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
<b>Focus Area - General Education Interventions</b>			
<b>NOTE: Screening for instructional purposes is not evaluation.</b> <i>The screening of a student by a teacher or specialist to determine appropriate instructional strategies for curriculum implementation shall not be considered to be an evaluation for eligibility for special education and related services [IAC 281-41.302].</i>			
1) The district, in conjunction with the AEA, attempts to resolve the presenting problem or behaviors of concern in the general education environment <u>prior</u> to conducting a full and individual evaluation [IAC 281-41.312].	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
a) The district provides general notice to parents on an annual basis about the provision of general education interventions that occur as a part of the district's general program and that may occur at any time throughout the school year.	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
b) General education interventions include consultation with special education support and instructional personnel.	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
c) General education activities are documented and include the following:	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
i) measurable and goal-directed attempts to resolve the	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No

Are the district's policies, procedures and practices in compliance with federal and state law and regulations?	Policy	Procedure	Practice
Item presenting problem or behaviors of concern, ii) communication with parents, iii) collection of data related to the presenting problem or behaviors of concern, iv) intervention design and implementation, v) and systematic progress monitoring to measure the effects of interventions.			
<b>Focus Area - Systematic problem-solving process</b> <i>When used by an AEA in its identification process, "systematic problem-solving" means a set of procedures that is used to examine the nature and severity of an educationally related problem. These procedures primarily focus on variables related to developing effective educationally related interventions. (IAC 281-41.313).</i>			
1) At a minimum, the systematic problem-solving process includes the following:	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
a) <i>Description of the problem.</i> The presenting problem or behavior described in objective, measurable terms that focus on alterable characteristics of the individual and the environment. The individual and environment is examined through systematic data collection. The presenting problem or behaviors of concern are defined in a problem statement that describes the degree of discrepancy between the demands of the educational setting and the individual's performance.	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
b) <i>Data collection and problem analysis.</i> A systematic, data-basis process for examining all that is known about the presenting problem or behaviors of concern is used to plan and monitor interventions.	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
i) Data is collected in multiple settings using multiple sources of information and multiple data collection methods;	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
ii) Data collection procedures are individually tailored, valid and reliable;	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
iii) Data collection procedures allow for frequent and repeated measurement of intervention effectiveness.	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
c) <i>Intervention design and implementation.</i> Interventions are designed based on the preceding analysis:	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
i) The defined problem;	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
ii) Parent input;	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
iv) Professional judgments about the potential effectiveness of interventions;	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
v) Interventions are described in an intervention plan that include the following: (1) Goals and strategies; (2) A progress monitoring plan; (3) A decision-making plan for summarizing and analyzing progress monitoring data; (4) The responsible parties.	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
d) <i>Progress monitoring.</i> Systematic progress monitoring is			

Are the district's policies, procedures and practices in compliance with federal and state law and regulations?  Item	Policy	Procedure	Practice
<p>conducted which include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Regular and frequent data collection;</li> <li>ii) Analysis of individual performance across time;</li> <li>iii) Modification of interventions as frequently as necessary based on systematic progress monitoring data,</li> <li>e) <i>Evaluation of intervention effects.</i> The effectiveness of interventions is evaluated through a systematic procedure in which patterns of individual performance are analyzed and summarized. Decisions regarding the effectiveness of interventions focus on comparisons with initial levels of performance.</li> </ul>			
<b>Focus Area - Progress monitoring and data collection</b>			
<p>1) <i>Evidence of progress in general education instructions.</i> The district has established standards by which the adequacy of general education instruction, including the quality and quantity of data gathered is assessed, and whether such data are sufficient in quantity and quality to make decisions. (IAC 281-41.314).</p>	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
<b>Focus Area – Determination of eligibility</b>			
<p>1) <i>Special rule for eligibility determination.</i> [281 IAC 41.306(2)]. A child must be determined to be a child with a disability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If the determinate factor for that determination is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Lack of appropriate instruction in reading, including the essential components of reading instruction</li> <li>(2) Lack of appropriate instruction in math; or</li> <li>(3) Limited English proficiency</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No	Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No	Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No
<p>2) <i>Procedures for determining eligibility and educational need.</i> [281 IAC 41.306(3)].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. In interpreting evaluation data for the purpose of determining if a child is a child with a disability under this chapter, and the educational needs of the child, each public agency must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Draw upon the information from a variety of sources, including aptitude and achievement tests, parent input, and teacher recommendations as well as information about the child's physical condition, social or cultural background, and adaptive behavior; and</li> <li>(2) Ensure that information obtained from all of these sources is documented and carefully considered.</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. If a determination is made that the child has a disability and needs special education and related services an IEP must be developed</li> <li>c. All determinations of eligibility must be based on the individual's disability (progress and discrepancy) and</li> </ul>	Yes No   Yes No  Yes No	   Yes No  Yes No  Yes No	Yes No   Yes No  Yes No

Are the district's policies, procedures and practices in compliance with federal and state law and regulations?	Policy	Procedure	Practice
Item			
need for special education.			
<b>Focus Area – Evaluations and Reevaluations</b>		<b>Yes No</b>	
1) In conducting an evaluation, the district, in accordance with IAC 281-41-304(2):	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>	
a. Uses a variety of assessment tools and strategies to gather relevant functional, developmental and academic information;	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>
b. Does not use any single measure or assessment as the sole criterion for determining whether a child is a child with a disability or determining an appropriate educational program for the student;	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>
c. Use technically sound instruments that may assess the relative contribution of cognitive and behavioral factors, in addition to physical or developmental factors.			<b>Yes No</b>
2) The AEA and district ensure that assessments and other evaluation materials are in accordance with IAC 281-41.304(3) as follows:	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>
a. Are selected and administered so as not to be discriminatory on a racially or culturally basis;	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>
b. Are provided and administered in the child's native language or other mode of communication most likely to yield accurate information on what the child knows and can do academically; developmentally, and functionally unless it is clearly not feasible to so provide or administer;	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>
c. Materials and procedures used to assess a student with limited English proficiency are selected and administered to ensure that they measure the extent to which the student has a disability and needs special education, rather than measure the child's English language skills;	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>
d. Assessments and evaluations are used for the purposes for which they are valid and reliable;	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>
e. Assessments and evaluations are administered by trained and knowledgeable personnel;	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>
f. Assessments and evaluations are administered with any instructions by the producer of the assessments.	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>
3) Assessments and other evaluation materials include those tailored to assess specific areas of educational need and not merely those that are designed to provide a single general intelligence quotient [281 IAC 41.304(3)b].	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>
4) Assessments are selected and administered so as best to ensure that if an assessment is administered to a child with impaired sensory, manual, or speaking skills, the assessment results accurately reflect the child's aptitude or achievement level or whatever other factors the test purports to measure,	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>

<b>Are the district's policies, procedures and practices in compliance with federal and state law and regulations?</b>  <b>Item</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Procedure</b>	<b>Practice</b>
rather than reflecting the child's impaired sensory, manual, or speaking skills (unless those skills are the factors that the test purports to measure) [281 IAC 41.304(3)c].			
5) The child is assessed in all areas related to the suspected disability [281 IAC 41.304(3)d].	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>
6) Assessments of children with disabilities who transfer from one public agency to another public agency in the same school year are coordinated with those children's prior and subsequent schools, as necessary and as expeditiously as possible to ensure completion of full evaluations [281 IAC 41.304(3)e].	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>
7) Assessment tools and strategies that provide relevant information that directly assists persons in determining the educational needs of the child are provided [281 IAC 41.304(3)g].	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>
8) If a child with a disability who had an IEP that was in effect in a previous public agency in another state transfers to a public agency in this state and enrolls in a new school within the same school year, the receiving public agency , in consultation with the parents, must provide the child with FAPE, including services comparable to 281 IAC 41.323(6).	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>	<b>Yes No</b>

## SECTION 4

## TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

In the form below, describe the technical assistance and/or professional development that has been conducted at the AEA and for the districts the AEA serves regarding disproportionality (e.g., how to analyze/disaggregate data, differentiation of instruction, progress monitoring, cultural competency, understanding racial biases, etc.).

Topic and Presenters	Provide a brief description of the technical assistance	Audience (e.g., district general education teachers, AEA Regional Administrators, etc.)	Date of Training



## SECTION 5

## RESULTS/FINDINGS FORM

Based on the review, does the AEA conclude that disproportionate representation is a result of inappropriate identification policy procedures and/or practices?	Yes    No
---	-----------

If the AEA review resulted in any policy, procedure or practice that contributes the inappropriate identification of children with disabilities, please complete the following table:

Policy, Procedure and/or Practice	Describe how policy, procedure and/or practice contributes to inappropriate identification or disproportionate representation	Describe or attach a copy of any revised policy, procedure and/or practice

**Statement of Assurance**

**Disproportionality**  
**2010-2011 School Year**  
**(FFY08 Data)**

**AEA:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Date of Submission:** \_\_\_\_\_

The ----- AEA hereby assures the Iowa Department of Education that the information presented in this review of disproportionality is accurate and the review was conducted according to the protocols set forth in this document.

**AEA Director (Printed Name)** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Date** \_\_\_\_\_

**AEA Director (Signature)** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Date** \_\_\_\_\_

### CHECKLIST

---

- ☐ **SECTION 1 – Data Review**
  - ☐ **SECTION 2 – Related Issues and Practices Review**
  - ☐ **SECTION 3 – Policies, Procedures and Practices Review**
  - ☐ **RESULTS/FINDINGS FORM**
  - ☐ **COPIES OF REVISED POLICIES ATTACHED (If Applicable)**
  - ☐ **Statement of Assurance**
- 

**Mail a completed copy of the entire document and required attachments to the Iowa Department of Education at the following address:**

Cheryl Merical, Consultant  
Bureau of Student and Family Support  
Services  
Iowa Department of Education  
400 E. 14<sup>th</sup> Street  
Des Moines, IA 50319

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)

## Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

In the OSEP Response Table to Iowa for FFY 2008 (2008-2009) OSEP states that:

*The State is not required to report on this indicator.*

<b>Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality</b>
--

**Indicator 10:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

<p><b>Measurement:</b></p> <p>Percent = [(number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (number of districts in the State)] times 100.</p> <p>Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."</p> <p>Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.</p>
---

**Measurable and Rigorous Target:**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009 (2009-2010)	

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

The Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) was developed by State Education Agency (SEA) staff reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. The 60-day timeline data were analyzed with the following key stakeholders: Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Area Education Agency (AEA) administration, and the Iowa Department of Education staff.

In the FFY 2008 (2008-2009) Response Letter from OSEP, for Indicator 11, the OSEP Analysis/Next Steps were summarized as:

*OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).*

*The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 is correctly implementing the timely initial evaluation requirements. Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must also report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.*

*When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 and each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.*

*If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.*

*It is unclear to OSEP how the State is using the 95% threshold to ensure systemic compliance when in fact the State requires 100% compliance. Also, it is unclear to OSEP whether the State uses the same 95% threshold to verify correction. OSEP will follow-up with the State on the use of a threshold when ensuring compliance and verifying correction.*

Hence, in this APR, the SEA will (a) demonstrate that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 is correctly implementing the timely initial evaluation requirements, (b) report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008, (c) clarify the manner in which the state uses a 95% threshold to require a corrective action plan.

The SEA will report to the public progress and/or slippage in meeting the “measurable and rigorous targets” found in the SPP/APR by posting on the State of Iowa Department of Education website ([http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592)) sometime after Feb 1, 2011 but no later than April 1, 2011, the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) APR submitted to OSEP. Any changes to the SPP accepted by OSEP will be posted within 30 days of receipt of the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) response letter to Iowa expected for receipt prior to July 1, 2011.

Performance of AEAs and LEAs on appropriate indicators will be posted by June 1, 2011. AEA profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590). District

profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591). Iowa's

Accountability Workbook is available at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308).

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

**Indicator 11:** Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a) (3) (B))

**Measurement:**

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in a but not included in b. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

**Measurable and Rigorous Target:**

The conduct of an evaluation within 60 days of receipt of parent consent is a compliance indicator and OSEP designated the measurable and rigorous target at 100%. Each annual target of the six-year State Performance Plan is set at 100%.


FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2009</b> <b>(2009-2010)</b>	100% of children with parental consent to evaluate will be evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline).

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

The State of Iowa uses the date of receipt of consent by the public agency, as the date for starting the 60-day calendar for completion of the evaluation. The State uses date of evaluation as the date for stopping the calendar for calculating the timeline. At all pertinent times, Iowa's definition of 60-day timeline is identical to the federal definition contained in the 2004 IDEA amendments and the 2006 IDEA regulations.

Data reported below were generated from Iowa's Information Management System. The data reflect all children and youth in Iowa who were evaluated for determination of eligibility for an IEP, during FFY 2009 (2009-2010). The data were entered into the database by trained personnel, using the federal definition for 60-day timeline for evaluation (initial evaluations). The data taken from the monitoring system are based on actual (not an average) number of days. The number of children with parental consent to evaluate, the 60-day timeline calculation, range of days beyond the timeline when evaluations were completed, and reasons for delay, are reported for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Figure B11.1 depicts the SEA baseline data from FFY 2005 (2005-2006) through actual target data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).



**Figure B11.1. Percent of SEA Evaluations Meeting the 60-Day Timeline Requirement.** Source. Iowa Information Management System, FFY 2005 (2005-2006) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Iowa did not meet the measureable and rigorous target for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) for Indicator B11, but did show substantial compliance with 98.04% of SEA evaluations meeting the 60-day evaluation timeline. Performance for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) is below the OSEP target of 100%, but shows improvement from the actual target data of 97.74% obtained during FFY 2008 (2008-2009).

Table B11.1 contains the actual numbers for both of the OSEP measures (a, b) in addition to those included in (a) but not in (b). Specifically, data are reported for (a) the number of children with parental consent to evaluate, (b) the number of evaluations completed within the 60-day timeline, and (c) the number of evaluations not completed within the 60-day timeline.

**Table B11.1**  
**SEA Number for Each Required Measure for (a), (b), and (c) and Timely Evaluation**

<b>60-Day Timeline Measure</b>	<b>Number</b>
a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.	13189
b. # of evaluations completed within the 60-day timeline	12930
c. # not completed within the 60-day timeline (included in a, but not b)	259
d. Percent = b/a times 100. 12930 divided by 13189=.9804 .9804 times 100 = 98.04	
	98.04%

Source. Iowa Information Management System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Table B11.1 summarizes data depicted in Figure B11.1, showing that Iowa did not meet the measureable and rigorous target for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) for Indicator B11. The number of children and youth in FFY 2009 (2009-2010) who were evaluated within the 60-day timeline was 12930 of 13189 (98.04%). Two-hundred-fifty-nine children received parental consent to evaluate, but the evaluation was not completed within 60 days of receipt by the public agency. The data reported are consistent with the measurement, and no explanation of variance is required.

Table B11.2 provides the reason and range of days beyond the 60-day evaluation timeline.


**Table B11.2**  
**Reason and Range of Days Beyond 60-Day Evaluation Timeline**

<b>Reason</b>	<b>Number of cases</b>
Family reason	126
Child's hospitalization/long-term illness	1
Mutual agreement	4
Natural disaster	36
Student transferred	1
No valid reason	91
Total	259
<b>Range of days beyond 60-day timeline when meeting was held</b>	
1-130 days	

Source. Iowa Information Management System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Results of FFY 2009 (2009-2010) percent of evaluations completed within 60 days are further analyzed at the Area Education Agency (AEA) level. These results are depicted in Figure B11.2.





**Figure B11.2. Evaluation Timelines met, by AEA and State, Compared to Target (FFY 2008 [2008-2009]).** Source. Iowa Information Management System, FFY 2008 (2008-2009) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

The data depicted in Figure B11.2 show that one of 10 AEAs met the measureable and rigorous target of 100% of evaluations completed within 60 days for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Table B11.3 provides raw numbers used in the calculations for Figure B11.2.

**Table B11.3**  
Actual Numbers Used by AEA and State

AEA										
1	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	State
(A) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received										
932	1830	873	1288	1574	3454	1116	738	320	1064	13189
(B) Number whose evaluations were completed within 60 days										
932	1784	871	1271	1539	3403	1105	680	306	1039	12930
(C) Number included in A but not in B or C										
0	46	2	17	35	51	11	58	14	25	259
(D) Percent = (B/ A) * 100										
100.00	97.49	99.77	98.68	97.78	98.52	99.01	92.14	95.63	97.65	98.04

Source. Iowa Information Management System FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

*Discussion of Improvement Activities That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).* Meeting targets for each indicator in the SPP is a priority for Iowa, and resources have been committed to each indicator and across indicators, to impact actual target data for each FFY on which performance is reported.

Consistent with activities documented in the SPP, several improvement activities were implemented to impact meeting the targets for this indicator. While activities have not changed, the headings used to describe each activity were changed to match the Improvement Activity headings in the APR Checklists.

Improvement activities, Measureable Outcomes, and Status/Next Steps are summarized in Table B11.4.

**Table B11.4**  
**Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

<b>Improvement Activity</b>	<b>Measurable Outcomes</b>	<b>Status/Next Steps</b>
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> Ongoing clarification and assistance was provided to all AEAs to ensure uniformity in understanding data requirements and exclusionary issues.	Improved accuracy of start, stop dates as well as accurate reasons for delay were entered in 60-day timeline and data fields.	Staff will receive ongoing clarification and assistance annually through FFY 2010 (2010-2011).
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> SEA requires a corrective action plan for Indicator 11 for any AEA remaining out of compliance at the systemic level.	Corrective action plans were required for AEA remaining out of compliance.	Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). The requirement of corrective action plans for noncompliance was conveyed to directors.
<b>Clarify/examine/develop policies and procedures.</b> AEAs developed a statewide special education procedures manual clearly stating the 60-day evaluation timeline requirement.	All AEAs have procedures for the 60-day evaluation timeline requirement that remain consistent with the federal definition.	All AEAs have adopted the 60-day evaluation timeline that is consistent with the federal definition. The statewide special education procedures manual is finalized.
<b>Improve data collection and reporting.</b> AEA data teams were asked to access their B11 data regularly to monitor 60-day evaluation timeline data.	Increased focus on Indicator B11 data. Increased validity and reliability of data.	Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). A process by which all AEAs could access their own B11 data was developed. Each AEA was encouraged to review their data on a monthly basis.
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> Ongoing information was provided to special education teachers in Iowa and AEA support staff regarding the 60-day evaluation timeline requirement via the Web IEP DVD.	Data on 60-day evaluation timelines collected via the Web IEP will be accurate and reliable.	Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Content is infused in all IEP writing training modules.

*Explanation of Progress or Slippage.* Iowa did not meet the target of 100% compliance, but showed progress from FFY 2008 (2008-2009) and demonstrated substantial compliance at a level greater than 95%. In FFY 2008 (2008-2009) the percent of SEA evaluations meeting the 60-day timeline requirement was 97.74%, while in FFY 2009 (2009-2010) the actual target data increased to 98.04%.

SEA personnel attribute this improvement to: (a) continued efforts on the part of SEA and AEA staff to emphasize the importance of conducting evaluations within the 60-day timeline, and (b) the continued use of verification reports to aid AEAs in ensuring that evaluations are conducted within the 60-day timeline.

**Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):**

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2008 for this indicator: 97.74%

13. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009)	195
14. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	195
15. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

**Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):**

16. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
17. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
18. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

**Actions Taken Regarding Noncompliance:**

The SEA uses data from the state database designed to track special education evaluation and placement data. These data are used to determine the extent to which 60-day timelines are being met statewide, and which AEAs are or are not meeting the 60-day timeline. In FFY 2009 (2009-2010), the SEA determined that noncompliance was occurring primarily because AEAs were not regularly checking if evaluations were being completed within the 60-day timeline. As a result, the SEA increased its emphasis on the use of verification reports to help meet the timelines.

AEAs below 95% compliance are required to write a corrective action plan (CAP) to correct systemic compliance issues. Iowa would like to clarify that the threshold of 95% is used only to determine which AEAs are required to write corrective action plans, not to determine noncompliance. Any noncompliance issue falling below 100% is cited, corrected, and verified.

Based on FFY 2009 (2009-2010) data, one AEA (AEA 13) will be required to write a corrective action plan. The same AEA was required to submit a corrective action plan based on FFY 2008 (2008-2009) data and did so in a timely manner. The SEA ensures that steps in the corrective action plan are completed by monitoring implementation of the CAP through Iowa's ISTAR system, assigning SEA personnel to monitor implementation of the CAP, and by verifying implementation through data.

While Iowa was able to verify correction of all noncompliance for FFY 2008 (2008-2009), the state has procedures in place should timely correction not take place in the future. Iowa's Administrative Rules of Special Education provide the SEA with the latitude to take enforcement actions in cases of noncompliance with the IDEA including, but not limited to, requiring a corrective action plan, withholding payments under Part B, and referring the matter for enforcement to the Department of Justice or state auditor. [IAC 281-41.604]

**Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent):**

Iowa verified the correction of noncompliance identified in the FFY 2008 (2008-2009) APR by (a) verifying that every child for whom consent to evaluate was received subsequently received an evaluation, even if late, unless the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA, and (b) verifying that each LEA that was performing below 100% compliance in FFY 2008 (2008-2009) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Verification of correction of individual noncompliance (Prong 1) occurs in the ISTAR system and state data system in two ways. First, the AEA verifies that for each child for whom the timeline was exceeded, an evaluation was conducted and an IEP was developed with appropriate services, if eligible. Then the SEA verifies the same information on the IEP and in the statewide data system. Child-specific noncompliance is considered “verified” when both steps have been completed. Verification of correct implementation of the regulatory requirement (Prong 2) is done by analyzing updated data in a sample from the state’s data system subsequent to the period during which the noncompliance was found, but within the one-year correction period. To be determined to be correctly implementing the regulatory requirement, an LEA is required to meet 100% compliance in a sample of three new evaluations. The time period examined begins six months from notification of findings of noncompliance and ends three months later.

**Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 findings:**

While there were no outstanding findings of individual noncompliance from FFY 2007 (2007-2008), Iowa was charged in the FFY 2008 (2008-2009) OSEP Response Table to “*demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 is correctly implementing the timely initial evaluation requirements*”. This was done using the same sampling method as described above for FFY 2008 verification. All LEAs determined to have noncompliance in FFY 2007 were subsequently determined to be correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010 (2010-2011):**

As this is a compliance indicator, there will be no revisions to the measureable and rigorous target of 100%.

Proposed activities for FFY 2010 (2010-2011) are presented in Table B11.5. These activities are consistent with what was proposed in the FFY 2004 (2004-2011) State Performance Plan and describe activities to be implemented in FFY 2010 (2010-2011). These activities will allow Iowa to meet measureable and rigorous targets for both FFY 2010 (2010-2011) and the targets continuing in the SPP through FFY 2012 (2012-2013).

(Note: Activities listed as ongoing in Table B11.4 will continue in FFY 2010 (2010-2011), and are not listed in Table B11.5).

**Table B11.5**  
**Proposed Activities for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**

Proposed Activity	Proposed Personnel Resources	Proposed Timelines	Anticipated Outcomes
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> SEA will require a corrective action plan for Indicator 11 for any AEA remaining out of compliance at the systemic level.	Three SEA Staff	July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011	Actual data for Indicator B11 will increase to 100%.
<b>Improve data collection and reporting.</b> AEA data teams will be asked to access their B11 data regularly to monitor 60-day evaluation timeline data.	One SEA Staff Assigned AEA staff	July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011	Increased focus on Indicator B11 data. Increased validity and reliability of data.
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> Ongoing clarification and assistance will be provided to all AEAs to ensure uniformity in understanding data requirements and exclusionary issues.	DE staff persons AEA special education directors	July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011	Actual data for Indicator B11 will increase to 100%.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

The Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) was developed by State Education Agency (SEA) staff reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included the State Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Area Education Agency (AEA) administration and the Iowa Department of Education staff.

In the FFY 2008 (2008-2009) Response Letter to Iowa, OSEP's analysis and next steps for Iowa were as follows:

*The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 is correctly implementing the early childhood transition requirements. Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must also report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.*

*When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 and each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.*

*If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.*

*It is unclear to OSEP how the State is implementing the 95% threshold to ensure systemic compliance when in fact they require 100% compliance. Also, it is unclear to OSEP whether the State uses the same 95% threshold to verify correction. OSEP will follow-up with the State on the use of a threshold when ensuring compliance and verifying correction.*

Hence, in this APR, the SEA will (a) demonstrate that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 is correctly implementing early childhood transition requirements, (b) report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008, (c) clarify the manner in which the state uses a 95% threshold to require a corrective action plan.

The SEA will report to the public progress/and or slippage in meeting the "measurable and rigorous targets" found in the SPP/APR by posting on the State of Iowa Department of Education website ([http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592)) sometime after Feb 1, 2011 but no later than April 1, 2011, the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) APR submitted to OSEP. Any changes to the SPP accepted by OSEP will be posted within 30 days of receipt of the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) response letter to Iowa expected for receipt prior to July 1, 2011.

Performance of AEAs and LEAs on appropriate indicators will be posted by June 1, 2011. AEA profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590). District profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591). Iowa's

Accountability Workbook is available at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308).

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition**

**Indicator 12:** Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age three, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

The following measurement for this indicator was a requirement of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) for both the six-year State Performance Plan and each Annual Performance Report.

**Measurement:**

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.
- e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

Account for children included in a but not included in b, c, d or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e)] times 100.

**Measurable and Rigorous Target:**

Indicator 12 (percent of children referred by Part C prior to age three, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays) is a compliance indicator and OSEP designated the measurable and rigorous target at 100%. Each annual target of the six-year State Performance Plan is set at 100%.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2009 (2009-2010)</b>	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age three, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

Table B12.1 summarizes actual target data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

**Table B12.1**  
**State Totals for Number and Percent of Children Served in Part C and Referred to Part B, Determined Ineligible for Part B, Determined Eligible for Part B and for whom Parent Refusal to Provide Consent Caused Delay**


Effective Transition Measure	Number
a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.	1218
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.	50
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1162
d. Number of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services	0
e. Number of children referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays	1
Percent = c divided by (a – b – d – e) times 100. Percent = 1162 divided by 1167 times 100.	99.57%

*Note: 5 children were included in a but not b or c, none of whom had delay caused by parent refusal to provide consent. Reasons for delay for all 5 children are reported in Table B12.2.*

*Source. Iowa Information Management System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).*

Results of data in Table B12.1 indicate the measurable and rigorous target of 100% was not met for FFY 2009 (2009-2010), but that Iowa did meet substantial compliance of 95% or more, with actual target data showing that 99.57% of children referred to Part B and determined eligible had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. Actual target data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) increased from the FFY 2008 (2008-2009) actual target data of 95.39%.

Figure B12.1 summarizes the state of Iowa trend from FFY 2004 (2004-2005) to FFY 2009 (2009-2010), for percent of children who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.



**Figure B.12.1. Percent of Eligible Children with IEP Developed and Implemented by Age 3, FFY 2004 (2004-2005) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).** Source: Iowa's Information Management System, FFY 2004 (2004-2005) - FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Iowa did not meet the target for Indicator 12 for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) but did meet substantial compliance of greater than 95% with 99.57% of eligible children having an IEP developed and implemented by age three.

Indicator 12 has an additional required measurement to: (a) account for children included in "a" but not included in "b," "c," "d," or "e" and (b) indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined, IEP was developed and implemented and reasons for the delays.

Table B12.2 summarizes information on number of children included in measure "A" of effective transition, but not in measure "B," "C," "D" or "E", and the range of delays beyond the third birthday.



**Table B12.2**  
**Children Included in "A" but not in "B", "C", "D" or "E" and Range of Delays Beyond Third Birthday**

<b>Reason</b>	<b>Number of cases</b>
Family reason	0
Child's hospitalization/long-term illness	0
Mutual agreement	1
Natural disaster	0
No valid reason	3
Evaluation permission delay	1
Total	5
<b>Range of days beyond third birthday when meeting was held</b>	
3-252 days	


Source: Iowa Information Management System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Table B12.3 provides information for all measures of effective transition for the State and for each Area Education Agency (AEA) in Iowa for FFY 2009 (2009-2010), while figure B12.2 illustrates trend information by AEA for FFY 2008 (2008-2009) and FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

**Table B12.3**  
**Number of Children Served in Part C and Referred to Part B, Determined Ineligible for Part B, Determined Eligible for Part B, for whom Parent Refusal to Provide Consent Caused Delay, and who were Referred to Part C less than 90 Days before their 3<sup>rd</sup> Birthdays**

<b>AEA</b>									
1	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	15	State
<b>(A) Number of children served in Part C and referred to Part B</b>									
84	169	89	136	193	266	94	92	95	1218
<b>(B) Number referred determined not eligible whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthday</b>									
0	5	6	11	6	1	11	5	5	50
<b>(C) Number found eligible who had an IEP developed/implemented by their third birthday</b>									
83	163	83	124	187	263	82	87	90	1162
<b>(D) Number for whom parental refusal to provide consent caused delay</b>									
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>(E) Number referred to Part C less than 90 days prior to their third birthday</b>									
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
<b>Number included in A but not B, C, D or E</b>									
1	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	5
<b>Percent = ((C) / (A-B-D-E))*100</b>									
98.81	99.39	100	99.20	100	99.25	100	100	100	99.57

Source: Iowa's Information Management System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).



**Figure B.12.2. Trend of Percent of Eligible Children with IEP Developed and Implemented by Age 3, by AEA and for the State of Iowa.** Source: Iowa's Information Management System, FFY 2008 (2008-2009) - FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

In FFY 2009 (2009-2010), 5 of 9 AEAs met the measurable and rigorous target for Indicator 12.

#### **Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

Discussion of Improvement Activities That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Meeting targets for each indicator in the SPP is a priority for Iowa, and resources have been committed to each indicator and across indicators to impact actual target data for each FFY on which performance is reported.

Consistent with activities documented in the SPP, several improvement activities were implemented to impact meeting the targets for this indicator. While activities have not changed, the headings used to describe each activity were changed to match the Improvement Activity headings in the APR Checklists.

Improvement activities, Measureable Outcomes, and Status/Next Steps are summarized in Table B12.5.

**Table B12.5**  
**Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

Improvement Activity	Measurable Outcomes	Status/Next Steps
<b>Improve systems administration and monitoring.</b> SEA will facilitate the development and implementation of the statewide procedures manuals for Parts B and C.	All AEAs will have uniform procedures around transition.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011).
<b>Improve data collection and reporting.</b> Primary progress for improving data collection and accuracy are attributed to the revision and the implementation of systematic procedures of the SEA's	Data for analysis and reporting are reliable and valid.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-

Improvement Activity	Measurable Outcomes	Status/Next Steps
Information Management System (IMS). Analysis of data from the SEA's IMS indicated inappropriate exit codes had been assigned when children exited Part C. As a result, the SEA completed revisions to the system data collection procedures including a revision of the exit code definitions. The SEA requests additional IMS data collection revisions in order to capture the number of days beyond the child's third birthday eligibility determination and IEP development is not implemented, and the reason for the delay.		2011).
<b>Improve data collection and reporting.</b> Data are analyzed by AEA leaders to identify systemic issues regarding meeting transition timelines for evaluation and implementation of an IEP and program implications.	Data analysis is used to inform AEA improvement plans.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011).
<b>Improve data collection and reporting.</b> Changes are made to the Eligibility Data Worksheet in the Web IEP and IMS to reflect the measurement of Indicator 12.	Iowa's data for Indicator 12 reflect the Part B measurement table.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011).
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> The SEA engaged the services of the North Central Regional Resource Center (RRC) to revise the training content and to assist with the development of statewide training regarding transition procedures.	Web-based training for services coordinators, IFSP and IEP teams was completed.	Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> The SEA provides training to data personnel regarding appropriate use of Part C exit codes.	More student records (approximately 99%) are correctly coded with an appropriate Part C exit code prior to data verification.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011).
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> The SEA provides thorough implementation guidance and training materials on the statewide transition policy and procedures that are adopted by all AEAs.	AEA adoption of unified policies and procedures and subsequent TA provided by the SEA led to greater statewide alignment with IDEA 2004 requirements and more accurate transition data.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011).
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> SEA implements statewide training for approved AEA trainers addressing service coordinator roles and responsibilities in the transition process.	Statewide training was implemented for service coordinators.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011).
<b>Improve data collection and reporting.</b> SEA data team distributed transition data to AEAs for validation and verification.	Exit codes and delay reasons for children leaving Part C were verified.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011).
<b>Evaluation.</b> SEA collaborated with the RRC to review and analyze web-based training evaluation data.	Evaluation data was used to assess effectiveness of training and plan ongoing support. It was determined that participants receiving the training passed the post-test.	Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> SEA facilitates development and implementation of parent information and training materials in partnership with the AEA Parent Educator Connection and Early Access regional leadership.	AEAs have materials with which to provide parents to inform them of their rights and of the transition process.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011).
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> SEA implements training to analyze and effectively address reasons for delay in evaluation and the development of an IEP by the third birthday.	Technical assistance was provided to Early ACCESS and EC Leadership Network and an action plan for further analysis and training was developed.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011).
<b>Improve systems administration and monitoring.</b> SEA monitors related requirements through Iowa's system of general supervision.	SEA identified and corrected noncompliance associated with transition requirements.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011).
<b>Improve systems administration and monitoring.</b> SEA monitors alignment of AEA improvement plans and transition data.	SEA identified necessary TA and targeted TA to specific AEAs. All AEAs reviewed Indicator 12 data. AEAs not meeting the target developed and implemented action plans related to transition.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011).

*Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).* Iowa showed improvement in this indicator from 95.39% in FFY 2008 (2008-2009) to 99.57% in FFY 2009 (2009-2010). The SEA attributes this progress to (a) continued emphasis by the SEA and AEAs on accurate data

collection and reporting practices around Indicator 12, and (b) continued emphasis by the SEA on the importance of timely and effective transition.

**Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (if State reported less than 100% compliance):**

Level of compliance (actual target data) State reported for FFY 2008 for this indicator: 95.39%

19. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009)	49
20. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	49
21. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

**Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):**

22. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
23. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
24. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

**Actions Taken Regarding Noncompliance:**

The SEA uses data from the state database tracking special education evaluation and placement data to determine the extent to which early childhood transition requirements are being met in the state, and to determine which AEAs are and are not meeting those requirements. In FFY 2009 (2009-2010), the SEA determined that noncompliance was occurring rarely and in isolated cases without a clear trend. As a result of the root cause analyses, the SEA continued to promote the use of verification reports in the state's database that alert AEAs to transition requirements.

AEAs below 95% compliance are required to write a corrective action plan (CAP) to correct systemic compliance issues. Iowa would like to clarify that the threshold of 95% is used only to determine which AEAs are required to write corrective action plans and not to determine noncompliance. Any noncompliance falling below 100% is cited, corrected, and verified. Based on FFY 2009 (2009-2010) data, no AEAs will be required to write a corrective action plan.

While Iowa was able to verify correction of all noncompliance for FFY 2008 (2008-2009), the state has procedures in place should timely correction not take place in the future. Iowa's Administrative Rules of Special Education provide the SEA with the latitude to take enforcement actions in cases of noncompliance with the IDEA including, but not limited to, requiring a corrective action plan, withholding payments under Part B, and referring the matter for enforcement to the department of justice or state auditor. [IAC 281-41.604]

***Verification of Correction (either timely or subsequent):***

Iowa verified the correction of noncompliance identified in the FFY 2008 (2008-2009) APR by (a) verifying that every child served in Part C and referred to Part B subsequently received an evaluation and – if eligible – a fully developed IEP, even if late, unless the child was no longer in the jurisdiction of the LEA, and (b) verifying that each LEA that was performing below 100% compliance in FFY 2008 (2008-2009) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b). Verification of correction of individual noncompliance (Prong 1) occurs in the ISTAR system and state data system in two ways. First, the AEA verifies that for each child for whom the timeline was exceeded, an evaluation was conducted and an IEP was developed with appropriate services, if eligible. Then the SEA verifies the same information on the IEP and in the statewide data system. Child-specific noncompliance is considered “verified” when both steps have been completed. Verification of correct implementation of the regulatory requirement (Prong 2) is done by analyzing updated data in a sample from the state’s data system subsequent to the period during which the noncompliance was found but within the one year correction period. To be determined to be correctly implementing the regulatory requirement, an LEA is required to meet 100% compliance in a sample of three new evaluations. The time period examined begins six months from notification of findings of noncompliance and ends three months later.

**Verification of Correction of Remaining FFY 2007 findings:**

While there were no outstanding findings of individual noncompliance from FFY 2007 (2007-2008), Iowa was charged in the FFY 2008 (2008-2009) OSEP Response Table to “*demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 is correctly implementing the early childhood transition requirements*”. This was done using the same sampling method as described above for FFY 2008 verification. All LEAs determined to have noncompliance in FFY 2007 were subsequently determined to be correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b).

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010 (2010-2011):**

No revisions are proposed for FFY 2010 (2010-2011).

## Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

## Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please see pages 1-5 for State Performance Plan Development

## Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

**Indicator :** Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There must also be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Measurement:**

Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There must also be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority)}}{\text{(\# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)}} \right] \times 100$ .

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

States are allowed to select a sample of IEPs to be reviewed in order to obtain data for this indicator. As described on page two of the General Instructions, States must provide a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. The description must include the: (a) sampling procedures followed (e.g., random/stratified, forms validation); and (b) similarity or differences of the sample to the population of students with disabilities (e.g., how all aspects of the population such as disability category, race, age, gender, etc. will be represented). The description must also include how the State Education Agency addresses any problems with: (1) response rates; (2) missing data; and (3) selection bias. The sampling method used is described in detail in Iowa's SPP for Indicator 13, updated for FFY 2006, and outlined here.

In order to obtain the sample for FFY 2009 (2009-2010), IEPs were randomly selected at the district level from the population of students with disabilities ages 14 and older in districts in the self-assessment year of Iowa's school improvement cycle. (Please note that Iowa Code requires that transition planning begin by age 14, rather than age 16, as stipulated by IDEA.) Sample size was determined using a 95% confidence interval with a margin of error of +/-10%. The sample was drawn with stringent confidence intervals because of the magnitude of decision-making based on the data. The sample was drawn to ensure representativeness. Responses were later assessed to validate the sample on representativeness by age, race and gender (see tables B13.1 – B13.3). (Please note that Iowa does not collect information on disability category).

The sample was drawn from districts in the self-assessment year within Iowa's school improvement cycle in FFY 2009 (2009-2010). These schools are scheduled for a future site visit during FFY 2011 (2011-2012).

The sample was drawn from districts according to the self-assessment year within Iowa's school improvement cycle. The improvement cycle ensures that every district is reviewed once every five years.

Data collection team members received training and passed three reliability checks with at least 75% accuracy prior to data collection. A response rate of 100% was achieved. To meet criteria for Indicator B-13, an IEP must contain all six of the elements listed below. (The survey instrumentation for Iowa, variable definitions and data collection score-sheets are included at the conclusion of Indicator B13.)

*Critical Element 1: Interests and Preferences.* Interests and preferences as they relate to post-secondary areas and student invitation to the meeting.

*Critical Element 2: Transition Assessments.* Assessment information listing specific data and the source of the data for each post-secondary area of living, learning and working is sufficient to determine that the post-secondary area was assessed.

*Critical Element 3: Post-secondary Expectations.* A statement for each post-secondary area of living, learning, and working is observable, based on assessment information and projects beyond high school.

*Critical Element 4: Course of Study.* The course of study must project to the student's anticipated end of high school, be based on needs and include: 1) a targeted graduation date; 2) the student's graduation criteria; and 3) any courses or activities the student needs to pursue his/her post-secondary expectations.

*Critical Element 5: Annual Goals.* All goals must support pursuit of the student's post-secondary expectations, be well-written and all areas of post-secondary expectations must have a goal or service / activity or the assessment information must clearly indicate there is no need for services in that post-secondary area.

*Critical Element 6: Services, supports, and activities.* Statements must specifically describe the services, supports and activities necessary to meet the needs identified through the transition assessment. Evidence that adult agencies and community organizations were involved as appropriate must also be present.

Data were collected through Iowa's System to Achieve Results (ISTAR), certified by AEA staff and validated through the ISTAR system. Selection bias was avoided to the largest possible extent by drawing a representative sample of IEPs at a high level of confidence and conducting the analysis only after weighting the data properly.

Sample data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) were assessed for similarity or difference of the sample to the population of students with disabilities ages 14-21. Tables B13.1, B13.2 and B13.3 present the representativeness of the sample of IEPs reviewed with respect to age, race/ethnicity and gender, respectively.

**Table B13.1**  
**Representativeness of IEPs Sampled by Age**

<b>Age</b>								
<i>Population Percent</i>								
14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	Total
5123	5291	5135	4903	2469	720	302	34	23977
<i>Response Percent</i>								
14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	Total
1123	1133	1029	978	465	78	31	5	4842
<i>Percent Difference</i>								
14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
1.83	1.33	-0.16	-0.25	-0.69	-1.39	-0.62	-0.04	

Source. Iowa Information Management System and ISTAR System, FFY 2007 (2007-2008).

Across ages, the percentage of IEPs sampled ranged from undersampling of 1.39 percent (age 19) to oversampling of 1.83 percent (age 14). The SEA interpreted the data in Table B13.1 as supportive of sufficient representation by age.

**Table B13.2**  
**Representativeness of IEPs Sampled by Race/Ethnicity**

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>							
<i>Population Percent</i>							
Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Hispanic/Latino	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Multiple	Total
184	233	1601	2297	22	19181	459	23977
<i>Response Percent</i>							
Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Hispanic/Latino	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Multiple	Total
29	35	275	225	6	4193	79	4842
<i>Percent Difference</i>							
Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Hispanic/Latino	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Multiple	Total
-0.17	-0.25	-1.00	-4.93	0.03	6.60	-0.28	

Source. Iowa Information Management System and ISTAR System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Across subgroups of race, the percentage of IEPs sampled ranged from undersampling of 4.93 percent (African-American) to oversampling of 6.60 percent (Caucasian). The SEA interpreted the data in Table B13.2 as supportive of sufficient stratification and representation by race/ethnicity.



**Table B13.3**  
**Representativeness of IEPs Sampled by Gender**

<b>Gender</b>		
<i>Population Percent</i>		
Female	Male	Total
36.35	63.65	23977
<i>Response Percent</i>		
Female	Male	Total
36.91	63.09	4842
<i>Percent Difference</i>		
Female	Male	Total
0.56	-0.56	

Source. Iowa Information Management System and ISTAR System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Across subgroups of gender, the percentage of IEPs sampled ranged from oversampling of 0.56 percent (female) to undersampling of 0.56 percent (male). The SEA interpreted the data in Table B13.3 as supportive of sufficient stratification and representation by gender.

Taken as a whole, Tables B13.1, B13.2, and B13.3 suggest that the sample resulted in representative data from which general inferences can be drawn.

Table B13.4 contains the raw numbers of IEPs reviewed in order to generate the actual target data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). In conducting the data analysis for Indicator 13, the Ns were weighted according to AEA population, as described in the State Performance Plan.


**Table B13.4**  
**Numbers of IEPs Reviewed by AEA, FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

AEA	1	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	State
N	305	869	398	298	515	1063	380	221	205	588	4842
Percent of total reviewed	6.30	17.95	8.22	6.15	10.64	21.95	7.85	4.56	4.23	12.14	100

Source. Iowa Information Management System FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

#### **Baseline Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

Baseline data for Indicator B13 for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) are summarized in Figure B13.1. Actual numbers and weighted numbers used in the calculations are provided in Table B13.5. The measurement for Indicator B13 was revised for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) reporting and the State Performance Plan has been revised accordingly.



**Figure B13.1. Percent of IEPs Meeting Indicator B13 Requirements, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).** Source. Iowa's ISTAR System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).


Iowa did not meet the measurable and rigorous target for Indicator 13 for FFY 2009 (2009-2010), with 66.48 percent of IEPs including coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable students to meet post-secondary goals. Table B13.5 presents the weighted and unweighted number of IEPs meeting Indicator B13 requirements.

**Table B13.5**  
Number of IEPs Meeting Indicator B13 Requirements, Weighted and Unweighted, FFY 2009 (2009-2010)

Measure	Unweighted	Weighted
B13	3231	43075.08
Total	4842	64792.00
Percent	66.73	66.48


Source. Iowa's ISTAR System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Iowa's standard for Indicator 13 requires that an IEP meet all six critical elements. (See survey instrumentation at the conclusion of this section.) If one or more of the critical elements are missing, the IEP is scored as not meeting the Indicator 13 criteria. Figure B13.2 depicts data on the critical elements of: (a) Preferences and Interests, (b) Transition Assessments, (c) Post-secondary Expectations, (d) Course of Study, (e) Goals that Support Post-Secondary Education, and (f) Services and Supports.




**Figure B13.2. Ratings of Six Critical Elements FFY 2009 (2009-2010).** Source. Iowa ISTAR System, FFY 2007 (2007-2008)

Figure B13.2 reflects the quality of IEPs for all six critical elements. Figures B13.3, B13.4, B13.5, and B13.6 depict specific criteria in critical elements in FFY 2009 (2009-2010).




**Figure B13.3. Specific Areas in Transition Assessment, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).** Source. Iowa ISTAR System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Figure B13.3 addresses quality of Transition Assessments. Iowa's criteria for the Transition Assessment critical element require that all three sub-elements (working, learning, and living) are present. If any of these sub-elements are not present, the IEP will be scored as not meeting the Transition Assessment critical element.




**Figure B13.4. Specific Areas in Course of Study, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).** Source. Iowa ISTAR System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Iowa's criteria for the Course of Study critical element require that all three sub-elements (graduation criteria, graduation date, and courses and activities) are present. If any of these sub-elements are not present, the IEP will be scored as not meeting the Course of Study critical element.



**Figure B13.5. Specific Areas in Post-Secondary Expectations, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).** *Source. Iowa ISTAR System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).*

Iowa's criteria for the Postsecondary Expectations critical element require that all three sub-elements (working, learning, and living) are present. If any of these sub-elements are not present, the IEP will be scored as not meeting the Postsecondary Expectations critical element.



**Figure B13.6. Specific Areas in Well Written Goals, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).** Source. Iowa ISTAR System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).


Iowa's criteria for the Goals critical element require that all three sub-elements (PSE areas, well-written goals, and goals that support PSE) are present. If any of these sub-elements are not present, the IEP will be scored as not meeting the Goals critical element.

### Discussion of Baseline Data:

Stakeholder groups with representatives of individuals with disabilities, parents, educators, administrators, private adult providers, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation Services, Department of Human Services, and higher education met to review the data, set priorities, and suggest improvement activities. The information provided is a summary of their input.

The baseline data indicated that 66.48% of the reviewed IEPs addressed all six Critical Elements. The percent of IEPs addressing each of the individual Critical Elements, however, ranged from 85.48% to 98.03% (see Table B13.2). The two Critical Elements most present in IEPs were Interests and Preferences (98.03%) and services and supports (89.11%). Course of Study and Postsecondary Expectations were present in 88.89% and 88.78% of the IEPs, respectively. Transition assessments met criteria in 87.45% of the IEPs and 85.48% of the IEPs had goals that met criteria for Indicator 13. Further examination of the aggregated critical elements (see Tables B13.3 – B13.6), shows that over 90% of all IEPs met the sub-elements criteria for B13.

Indeed, the overall data has shown an increasing trend line since it was first collected in FFY 05. Indicator B13 was 35.23% in FFY 07, up from 5% in FFY 05. Table B13.8 displays the growth in each of the Critical Elements using the previous definition. (The only changes in Iowa's definition were to add student invitation to Critical Element 1: Preferences and Interests and adjust the evidence needed for adult agency/organization in Critical Element 5: Services and Supports. These were very slight changes to an already rigorous definition, increasing the ability to comparisons across time.)



**Figure B13.8. Ratings of Six Critical Elements for FFY 2005 (2005-2006) through FFY 2007 (2007-2008).** Source. Iowa ISTAR System, FFY 2007 (2007-2008).

Stakeholder review of these data focused on the discrepancy between the lower overall percentage of IEPs that met the aggregated Indicator 13 calculation (66.48%) and the higher percentages of the Critical Elements (85.48% – 98.03%) and the higher percentages of the sub-elements ( 90.34% - 99.34%). It was determined that the discrepancy reflected IEP teams increased understanding of the necessary transition components and also their difficulty in aligning the components throughout the IEP. The group also requested further analysis of the data to identify any patterns of low- and high-scoring districts and AEAs as well as an examination of potential “data creep” – or movement away from original criteria.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2009 (2009-2010)</b>	<b>100% of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition service needs. There will also be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP team meeting where transition services were discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP team meeting with prior consent.</b>
<b>2010 (2010-2011)</b>	<b>100% of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition service needs. There will also be</b>

	evidence that the student was invited to the IEP team meeting where transition services were discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP team meeting with prior consent.
2011 (2011-2012)	100% of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measureable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition service needs. There will also be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP team meeting where transition services were discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP team meeting with prior consent.
2012 (2012-2013)	100% of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measureable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition service needs. There will also be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP team meeting where transition services were discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP team meeting with prior consent.

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

Based on (1) the structure outlined in the *Overview of State Performance Plan Development*, (2) Iowa's System, (3) broad stakeholder input, and (4) trend and current data, the following strategies will be completed over the duration of the State Performance Plan through June 30, 2013.

**Table B13.5**  
**Proposed Improvement Activities, FFY 2009 (2009-2010) through FFY 2012 (2012-2013)**

Proposed Activity	Proposed Personnel Resources	Proposed Timelines	Anticipated Outcomes
<b>Improve data collection.</b> Update training materials to reflect improved practice. Develop state reliability procedures. Develop "recalibration" procedures.	DE transition consultant, Independent contractor	FFY10 and ongoing as needed to June, 30 2013.	Actual materials and procedures, increased consistency across and within AEAs, Increased B13 percentage.
<b>Program development.</b> Gather and analyze needs assessment data for issues of practice in transition assessments (skills and service delivery issues).	DE transition consultant and others as relevant (e.g., severe cognitive, behavior) Independent contractor(s)	FFY10 and ongoing as needed to June, 30 2013.	Alignment of initiatives aimed at improving secondary services.
<b>Provide Technical assistance.</b> Develop tools to assist in the integration of transition components for development of course of study and annual goals and supports.	DE transition consultant and others as relevant (e.g., severe cognitive, behavior) Independent contractor(s)	FFY10 and ongoing as needed to June, 30 2013.	Improved cohesiveness of IEPs, improved relevance and rigor of services and supports resulting in increased graduation and postsecondary attendance and employment.
<b>Provide Technical assistance.</b> Provide Technical Assistance to Area Education Agencies to understand the integration of transition components for development of	DE transition consultant and others as relevant (e.g., severe cognitive,	FFY10 and ongoing as needed to June, 30 2013.	Increased amount, consistency and quality of professional development on course of study and annual goals/supports.



Proposed Activity	Proposed Personnel Resources	Proposed Timelines	Anticipated Outcomes
course of study and annual goals and supports.	behavior) Independent contractor(s) AEA content coaches		

## Indicator 13 Measurement

Item No.	Review Questions	Yes	No	NA	Criteria for response
<b>T20.</b> §300.43(a)(2) Also §300.321(b)(2) <b>Indicator B13</b> Age Group C only	Does the IEP include the student's preferences or interests?				<b>Yes</b> = Preferences or interests of the student are listed. (Interests = things that evoke curiosity. Preferences = things chosen over others). <b>No</b> = No interests or preferences are listed <b>OR</b> items listed are not the student's.
<b>T21a.</b> §300.320(b)(1) <b>Indicator B13</b>  Age Group C only	Does the IEP document that the postsecondary area of <b>living</b> has been sufficiently assessed and information used as basis of transition planning?				<b>Yes</b> = Specific data related to the student's living skills and the method of collection or source of the data are listed. Data are sufficient to determine that an assessment of the postsecondary area of living as it relates to student's postsecondary expectations for living was done. <b>No</b> = No specific data are listed <b>OR</b> the source or method of data collection is missing <b>OR</b> data are insufficient to determine that the post-secondary area of living has been assessed.
<b>T21b.</b> §300.320(b)(1) <b>Indicator B13</b>  Age Group C only	Does the IEP document that the postsecondary area of <b>learning</b> has been sufficiently assessed and information used as basis of transition planning?				<b>Yes</b> = Specific data related to the student's learning skills and the method of collection or source of the data are listed. Data are sufficient to determine that an assessment of the postsecondary area of learning as it relates to student's postsecondary expectations for learning was done. <b>No</b> = No specific data are listed <b>OR</b> the source or method of data collection is missing <b>OR</b> data are insufficient to determine that the postsecondary area of learning has been assessed.
<b>T21c.</b> §300.320(b)(1) <b>Indicator B13</b>  Age Group C only	Does the IEP document that the postsecondary area of <b>working</b> has been sufficiently assessed and information used as basis of transition planning?				<b>Yes</b> = Specific data related to the student's working skills and the method of collection or source of the data are listed. Data are sufficient to determine that an assessment of the postsecondary area of working as it relates to student's postsecondary expectations for working was done. <b>No</b> = No specific data are listed <b>OR</b> the source or method of data collection is missing <b>OR</b> data are insufficient to determine that the post-secondary area of working has been assessed.
<b>T22a.</b> §300.320(b)(1)	Is there a postsecondary				<b>Yes</b> = Postsecondary expectations statement incorporates observable post

Also §300.43(a)(1) <b>Indicator B13</b>	expectation of <b>living</b> that projects beyond high school, is consistent with available assessment information and is observable?				school outcomes in the area of living that are consistent with available transition assessment data. <b>No</b> = Area is not stated as an observable behavior <b>OR</b> is not addressed or addressed vaguely <b>OR</b> is inconsistent with available transition assessment data.
<b>Age Group C only</b>					

Item No.	Review Questions	Yes	No	NA	Criteria for response
<b>T22b.</b> §300.321(b)(1) Also §300.43(a)(1) <b>Indicator B13</b>	Is there a post-secondary expectation of <b>learning</b> that projects beyond high school, is consistent with available assessment information and is observable?				<b>Yes</b> = Postsecondary expectations statement incorporates observable post school outcomes in the area of learning that are consistent with available transition assessment data. <b>No</b> = Area is not stated as an observable behavior <b>OR</b> is not addressed or addressed vaguely <b>OR</b> is inconsistent with available transition assessment data.
<b>Age Group C only</b>					
<b>T22c.</b> §300.321(b)(1) Also §300.43(a)(1) <b>Indicator B13</b>	Is there a postsecondary expectation of <b>working</b> that projects beyond high school, is consistent with available assessment information and is observable?				<b>Yes</b> = Postsecondary expectations/vision statement incorporates observable post school outcomes in the area of working that are consistent with available transition assessment data. <b>No</b> = Area is not stated as an observable behavior <b>OR</b> is not addressed or addressed vaguely <b>OR</b> is inconsistent with available transition assessment data.
<b>Age Group C only</b>					
<b>T23a.</b> §300.320(b)(2) <b>Indicator B13</b>	Does the course of study identify graduation criteria?				<b>Yes</b> = Graduation requirements are clearly documented and the means are defined. <b>No</b> = Graduation requirements and means are not documented, unclear or vague.
<b>Age Group C only</b>					
<b>T23b.</b> §300.320(b)(2) <b>Indicator B13</b>	Does the course of study identify a targeted graduation date?				<b>Yes</b> = Graduation date is documented. <b>No</b> = Graduation date is not documented.
<b>Age Group C only</b>					
<b>T23c.</b> §300.320(b)(2) <b>Indicator B13</b>	Does the course of study project courses and				<b>Yes</b> = Courses and activities, if needed, are listed and project to the targeted graduation date.

Age Group C only	activities necessary to pursue the postsecondary expectations?				<b>No</b> = Needed courses and activities are not listed or are vague.
<b>T24a.</b> §300.320(b)(2) Also §300.43(a)(2) Indicator B13  Age Group C only	Do all the annual goals support pursuit of postsecondary expectations?				<b>Yes</b> = Each goal listed addresses a need listed in the PLAAFP and is necessary for the student to pursue targeted post-secondary expectations. <b>No</b> = One or more goals listed do not reflect a need listed in the PLAAFP or will not be necessary for the student to pursue targeted post-secondary expectations.
<b>T24b.</b> §300.320(b)(2) Also §300.43(a)(2) Indicator B13  Age Group C only	Are <b>all</b> the annual goals well written?				<b>Yes</b> = Evidence reviewed shows that all goals state the condition(s), skill or behavior, and criterion, including timeline. <b>No</b> = Evidence reviewed shows one or more goals are missing the condition, behavior, or criterion, including timeline.

Item No.	Review Questions	Yes	No	NA	Criteria for response
<b>T24c.</b> §300.320(b)(2) Also §300.43(a)(2) Indicator B13  Age Group C only	Are there goals, services or activities for every postsecondary area (Living, Learning, and Working)?				<b>Yes</b> = Each postsecondary area of living, learning, and working is addressed through goals, services or activities. <b>(If Yes, skip to T25)</b> <b>No</b> = One or more postsecondary area does not have a goal, service, or activity.
<b>T24d.</b> §300.320(b)(2) Also §300.43(a)(2) Indicator B13  Age Group C only	If not, is there justification in the PLAAFP?				<b>Yes</b> = Rationale for not needing services, supports or activities is listed in the PLAAFP and based on assessment information for each post-secondary area missing in question T24c. <b>No</b> = No rationale is listed for each postsecondary area not addressed through services, supports and activities <b>OR</b> rationale is not based on assessment data.
<b>T25.</b> §300.320(b)(2) Also §300.43(a)(2) Indicator B13  Age Group C only	Are there specific statements describing the services and supports necessary to accomplish the annual goals				<b>Yes</b> = Each service, activity and support marked "yes" has a narrative description on Page F that clearly indicates the amount of resources to be committed, a description of time allocated, a description of services to be provided (not a list), <b>AND</b> there is clarity of services. <b>No</b> = Not all services, activities and

[illegible]

	evaluation results?				
<b>SS51a</b> §300.321(b)(3) Indicator B13  Age Group C only	For this secondary transition-aged student, was a representative of a participating agency invited to the meeting with prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority, if applicable?				<b>Yes</b> = Meeting Notice form (or other appropriate documentation of meeting notification) indicates that, if applicable, representatives of participating agencies were invited to the meeting with prior consent of the parent or age-of-majority student. <b>No</b> = Meeting Notice form (or other appropriate documentation of meeting notification) indicates that, if applicable, representatives of participating agencies were NOT invited to the meeting with prior consent of the parent or age-of-majority student OR invited without prior consent OR no documentation of meeting notification exists.
Item No.	Review Questions	Yes	No	NA	<b>Criteria for Response</b>
<b>SS52.</b> §300.321(a)(7) Indicator B13  Age Group C only	Was the student invited to attend the IEP meeting? (age 14 and above)				<b>Yes</b> = Student's name is listed on the completed Meeting Notice or the student's meeting notification is otherwise appropriately documented. <b>No</b> = Student's name is NOT listed on the completed Meeting Notice or documentation of student's meeting notification is absent.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

The Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) was developed by State Education Agency (SEA) staff reviewing (a) trend data, (b) targets, and (c) improvement activities, and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding components (a) through (c), and comments were compiled.

Stakeholder groups made up of representatives of individuals with disabilities, parents, educators, administrators, private adult care providers, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation Services, Department of Human Services, and higher education met to review the data, set priorities, and suggest improvement activities. Additional input was sought from stakeholder groups including the State of Iowa Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Area Education Agency (AEA) administration, and staff of the State Education Agency (SEA).

In the FFY 2007 (2007-2008) Response Letter to Iowa, OSEP stated that Iowa is was required to report on Indicator 14 for FFY 2008 (2008-2009). Iowa was able to incorporate the changes in Indicator 14 outlined in the Part B Measurement Table (OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 2/29/2012) prior to collecting FFY 2008 (2008-2009) data, however, and did report on baseline data and net targets for Indicator 14 for FFY 2008 using the new measurement in an SPP template. Because new baseline data and targets were reported and accepted by OSEP in FFY 2008, for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) Iowa is reporting actual target data in an ARP template.

The SEA will report to the public progress/and or slippage in meeting the “measurable and rigorous targets” found in the SPP/APR by posting on the State of Iowa Department of Education website

([http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592)) sometime after Feb 1, 2011 but no later than April 1, 2011, the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) APR submitted to OSEP. Any changes to the SPP accepted by OSEP will be posted within 30 days of receipt of the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) response letter to Iowa expected for receipt prior to July 1, 2011.

Performance of AEAs and LEAs on appropriate indicators will be posted by June 1, 2011. AEA profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590).

District profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591).

Iowa's Accountability Workbook is available at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308).

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Indicator 14:** Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a) (3)(B))

**Measurement:**

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2009</b> <b>(2009-2010)</b>	<p>B14A: 28.20 percent of leavers will be enrolled in higher education</p> <p>B14B: 49.65 percent of leavers will be enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</p> <p>B14C: 85.14 percent of leavers will be enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment</p>

States are allowed to select a sample of IEPs to be reviewed in order to obtain data for this indicator. As described on page two of the General Instructions, States must provide a



description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. The description must include the: (a) sampling procedures followed (e.g., random/stratified, forms validation); and (b) similarity or differences of the sample to the population of students with disabilities (e.g., how all aspects of the population such as disability category, race, age, gender, etc. will be represented). The description must also include how the State Education Agency addresses any problems with: (1) response rates; (2) missing data; and (3) selection bias. There are no districts in Iowa with a student population greater than 50,000, so there are no districts that are required to be included in the sample every year. The sampling method used is described in detail in Iowa's SPP for Indicator 14 submitted for FFY 2006 (2006-2007) and outlined here.

*District sampling procedures.* The sample was drawn from districts in the self-assessment year within Iowa's school improvement cycle in FFY 2009 (2009-2010). These schools are scheduled for a future site visit during FFY 2011 (2011-2012). All districts participate at least one time in every 5-year period, thus all districts are included in the Indicator 14 measurement during the SPP cycle.

To ensure a balanced representation of the State across each year of the 5-Year cycle, the Department of Education hired Dr. Michael Larsen of the Iowa State University Department of Statistics as an advisor. Dr. Larsen's analysis of district assignments to the school improvement schedule indicated that the overall State representation is balanced across the years. Dr. Larsen also determined that a slight imbalance in representation *within* Area Education Agencies (AEAs) could be remedied by making minor adjustments in districts' assigned years or by weighting the data during analysis to correct for the imbalance. Weighting the results will also allow for a representative sample across Iowa including race / ethnicity and gender. The Department of Education decided to maintain the district assigned schedule and account for imbalances within AEAs by using weighted analysis procedures. State results will also be adjusted using weighting during analysis because there is not a probability mechanism employed in selecting districts for participation using the established school improvement cycle.

*Student sampling procedures.* Data were collected from two groups of former students: those who had IEPs at the time they exited high school and those who did not have IEPs at the time they exited high school. Sample selection procedures were established so that district data are representative of the districts and can be used for district improvement. Sample size was determined based on a 95% confidence level with a ten percent margin of error. The sample was drawn at the building level to ensure that data are representative of the building in districts with more than one high school. All leavers were included in the sample.

Data were collected via Iowa's System to Achieve Results (ISTAR), the state's web-based monitoring database, and submitted to the SEA, where they were validated. Missing data and outliers were flagged and verified.

Selection bias was avoided to the largest possible extent by drawing a representative sample of participants at a high level of confidence and conducting the analysis only after weighting the data properly.

Sample data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) were assessed for similarity or difference of the sample to the population of students with disabilities exiting school. Tables B14.1, B14.2 and B14.3 present the representativeness of the sample of IEPs reviewed with respect to age, race/ethnicity and gender, respectively.

**Table B14.1**  
**Representativeness of Participants Sampled by Age**

<b>Age</b>								
<i>Population</i>								
14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	Total
0.00	0.07	0.57	4.34	45.61	37.54	7.25	4.63	100
<i>Response Percent</i>								
14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	Total
0.00	1.29	0.97	2.27	51.13	36.57	5.18	2.59	100
<i>Percent Difference</i>								
14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
1.23	0.40	-2.07	5.53	-0.97	-2.07	-2.04	0.00	

Source. Iowa Information Management System and ISTAR System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Across ages, the percentage of participants ranged from undersampling of 2.07 percent (age 19) to oversampling of 5.53 percent (age 17). The SEA interpreted the data in Table B14.2 to indicate sufficient stratification and representation by age.

**Table B14.2**  
**Representativeness of Participants Sampled by Race/Ethnicity**

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>							
<i>Population Percent</i>							
Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Hispanic /Latino	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Multiple	Total
0.89	0.84	4.59	8.43	0.00	85.26	0.00	100
<i>Response Percent</i>							
Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Hispanic /Latino	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Multiple	Total
0.97	0.97	2.27	10.36	0.00	85.44	0.00	100
<i>Percent Difference</i>							
Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Hispanic /Latino	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	White	Multiple	
0.09	0.13	-2.32	1.93	0.00	0.18	0.00	

Source. Iowa Information Management System and ISTAR System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Across subgroups of race, the percentage of participants sampled ranged from undersampling of 2.32 percent (Hispanic/Latino) to oversampling of 1.93 percent (Black/African-American). The SEA interpreted the data in Table B14.2 as supportive of sufficient stratification and representation by race/ethnicity.

**Table B14.3**  
**Representativeness of IEPs Sampled by Gender**

<b>Gender</b>		
<i>Population Percent</i>		
Female	Male	Total
36.54	63.46	100
<i>Response Percent</i>		
Female	Male	Total
38.51	61.49	100
<i>Percent Difference</i>		
Female	Male	
1.97	-1.97	

Source. Iowa Information Management System and ISTAR System, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Across subgroups of gender, the percentage of IEPs sampled ranged from undersampling of 1.97 percent (male) to oversampling of 1.97 percent (female). The SEA interpreted the data in Table B14.3 to indicate sufficient stratification and representation by gender.

Taken as a whole, Tables B14.1, B14.2, and B14.3 suggest that the sample resulted in data that represent the population of interest.

#### **Actual Target Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**


Table B14.4 contains the raw numbers of participants surveyed in order to generate the actual target data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). In conducting the data analysis for Indicator 14, these numbers were weighted according to AEA population, as described in the State Performance Plan submitted in FFY 2006 (2006-2007).

**Table B14.4**  
**Response rate by AEA, FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>State</b>
<b>N Responses</b>	20	67	16	6	21	83	59	3	13	21	309
<b>N Targeted</b>	51	98	37	24	51	142	59	5	31	89	587
<b>Response Rate (%)</b>	39.22	68.37	43.24	25.00	41.18	58.45	100	60.00	41.94	23.60	52.64


Source. Iowa's Project EASIER FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and B14 Indicator Survey Responses FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Actual target data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) for Indicator 14A, the percent enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school, are depicted in Figure B14.1.




**Figure B14.1. Percentage of Youth with IEPs Enrolled in Higher Education Within One Year of Leaving High School.** Source. Iowa's Project EASIER, FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and B14 Indicator Survey Responses FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Figure B14.2 provides baseline data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) based on the measurement for Indicator 14B, the percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.




**Figure B14.2. Percentage of Youth with IEPs Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed Within One Year of Leaving High School.** Source. Iowa's Project EASIER, FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and B14 Indicator Survey Responses FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Figure B14.3 provides baseline data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) based on the measurement for Indicator 14C, the percent enrolled in higher education or some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.




**Figure B14.3. Percentage of Youth with IEPs Enrolled in Higher Education or Some Other Postsecondary Education or Training, or Competitively Employed or in Some Other Employment Within One Year of Leaving High School.** Source. Iowa's Project EASIER, FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and B14 Indicator Survey Responses FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Figure B14.4 presents state and AEA data for FFY 2009 on the percent of students who did and did not have IEPs who were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school. The difference between the percentages for students with and without IEPs is also presented.



**Figure B14.4. Percentage of Youth with and without IEPs Enrolled in Higher Education, State and AEA.** Source. Iowa's Project EASIER, FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and B14 Indicator Survey Responses FFY 2009 (2009-2010).


Figure B14.5 presents state and AEA data for FFY 2009 on the percent of students who did and did not have IEPs who were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. The difference between the percentages for students with and without IEPs is also presented.



**Figure B14.5. Percentage of Youth with and without IEPs Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed, State and AEA.** Source. Iowa's Project EASIER, FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and B14 Indicator Survey Responses FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Figure B14.6 presents state and AEA data for FFY 2009 on the percent of students who did and did not have IEPs who were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. The difference between the percentages for students with and without IEPs is also presented.





**Figure B14.6. Percentage of Youth with and without IEPs Enrolled in Higher Education or Some Other Postsecondary Education or Training, or Competitively Employed or in Some Other Employment, State and AEA.**  
 Source. Iowa's Project EASIER, FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and B14 Indicator Survey Responses FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Tables B14.5 and B14.6 present the raw numbers (weighted and unweighted) used in calculating the percentages for students with IEPs presented in Figures B14.1 through B14.6. Tables B14.7 and B14.8 present the raw numbers (weighted and unweighted) used in calculating the percentages for students without IEPs presented in Figures B14.4 through B14.6.

**Table B14.5**  
**Weighted Numbers Used in Calculation for Indicator 14 for Students with IEPs, State and AEA**

	1	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	State
<b>Higher education (1.)</b>	92.48	136.54	28.06	39.47	37.65	319.15	245.93	42.27	37.06	160.31	1138.92
<b>Competitively employed (2.)</b>	48.53	86.64	43.40	0.00	13.15	222.96	130.94	0.00	19.20	67.73	632.55
<b>Other education (3.)</b>	13.28	26.50	7.92	0.00	436.62	5.12	25.17	0.00	0.00	9.30	523.91
<b>Other employment (4.)</b>	18.74	103.22	24.43	9.87	3.28	151.23	126.69	0.00	5.29	67.55	510.30
<b>Not engaged</b>	18.08	122.59	16.23	9.87	3.27	238.25	63.07	0.00	11.35	52.14	534.85
<b>Total leavers</b>	191.11	475.49	120.04	59.21	493.97	936.71	591.80	42.27	72.90	357.03	3340.53

Source. Iowa's Project EASIER, FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and B14 Indicator Survey Responses FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

**Table B14.6**  
**Unweighted Numbers Used in Calculation for Indicator 14 for Students with IEPs, State and AEA**

	1	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	State
<b>Higher education (1.)</b>	10	20	4	4	11	26	24	3	7	8	117
<b>Competitively employed (2.)</b>	4	9	6	0	5	20	14	0	3	3	64
<b>Other education (3.)</b>	2	3	1	0	3	1	3	0	0	1	14
<b>Other employment (4.)</b>	3	14	3	1	1	17	10	0	1	3	53
<b>Not engaged</b>	1	21	2	1	1	19	8	0	2	6	61
<b>Total leavers</b>	20	67	16	6	21	83	59	3	13	21	309

Source. Iowa's Project EASIER, FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and B14 Indicator Survey Responses FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

**Table B14.7**  
**Weighted Numbers Used in Calculation for Indicator 14 for Students without IEPs, State and AEA**

	1	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	State
<b>Higher education (1.)</b>	4704.58	9172.66	4696.83	4865.73	6115.95	25832.62	3984.39	2919.29	1433.93	4800.29	68526.27
<b>Competitively employed (2.)</b>	347.77	1351.68	331.61	116.27	257.23	2062.80	326.43	172.12	274.35	636.05	5876.31
<b>Other education (3.)</b>	182.05	235.47	0.00	0.00	68.58	387.51	93.28	61.49	31.30	222.88	1282.56
<b>Other employment (4.)</b>	91.02	1045.17	263.27	0.00	279.23	2051.21	238.66	122.98	88.86	306.11	4486.51
<b>Not engaged</b>	136.58	939.17	326.29	0.00	206.45	964.43	47.92	172.12	57.56	376.67	3227.19
<b>Total leavers</b>	5462.00	12744.15	5618.00	4982.00	6927.44	31298.57	4690.68	3448.00	1886.00	6342.00	83398.84

Source. Iowa's Project EASIER, FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and B14 Indicator Survey Responses FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

**Table B14.8**  
**Unweighted Numbers Used in Calculation for Indicator 14 for Students without IEPs, State and AEA**

	1	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	State
<b>Higher education (1.)</b>	74	256	71	41	173	282	82	33	49	64	1125
<b>Competitively employed (2.)</b>	5	35	3	1	7	19	7	2	6	8	93
<b>Other education (3.)</b>	4	6	0	0	2	6	2	1	1	3	25
<b>Other employment (4.)</b>	2	27	4	0	8	15	7	2	3	4	72
<b>Not engaged</b>	5	39	9	0	14	20	8	4	5	9	113
<b>Total leavers</b>	88	336	83	42	196	327	99	40	61	84	1356

Source. Iowa's Project EASIER, FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and B14 Indicator Survey Responses FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Iowa uses weighted numbers to calculate percentages for Indicator 14. The calculations for Indicators 14A, 14B, and 14C are shown below:

$$14A = (1138.92/3340.53) * 100 = 34.09$$

$$14B = ((1138.92+632.55)/3340.53) * 100 = 53.03$$

$$14C = ((1138.92+632.55+523.91+510.30)/3340.53) * 100 = 83.99$$

### Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):

*Discussion of Improvement Activities That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).* Meeting targets for each indicator in the SPP is a priority for Iowa, and resources have been committed to each indicator and across indicators, to impact actual target data for each FFY on which performance is reported.

Consistent with activities documented in the SPP, several improvement activities were implemented to impact meeting the targets for this indicator. While activities have not changed, the headings used to describe each activity were changed to match the Improvement Activity headings in the APR Checklists.

Improvement activities, Measureable Outcomes, and Status/Next Steps are summarized in Table B14.9.

**Table B14.9**  
**Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

Activity	Measureable Outcomes	Status / Next Steps
<b>Improve data collection and reporting.</b> The SEA conducted analyses of survey data to ensure representativeness of all leavers.	Samples were drawn to ensure representativeness of all leavers. Representativeness of responders is described in text of Indicator B14.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Improve data collection and reporting.</b> The SEA identified and implemented strategies to increase response rate.	Provided districts with mechanism to monitor their response rates during data collection.  For the past two years the districts had a mechanism to monitor their response rates but did not receive incentive pay for each completed survey nor incentive funds for reaching 80% response rate. Response rate this year was 52.64%.	Ongoing as needed through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Improve data collection and reporting.</b> The SEA identified and implemented strategies to increase participation of students who exit from grades 9 – 11 within the general data collection process.	Inclusion in FY09 was sufficient. No other activities necessary for FY10.	Ongoing as needed through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Improve data collection and reporting.</b> The SEA gathered, reported, and analyzed Indicator B13 and B14 data with collaborative partners.	Presentations with IVRS, Governor's DD Council, SEAP, Postsecondary Providers, Parents and other stakeholders were completed. Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation Services is in the second year of using the system across the state.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Improve data collection and reporting.</b> The SEA hired a contractor to review the senior exit and one year follow-up surveys to account for student participation in community college and other college level courses while in high school.	Contractor (SRI) completed analysis comparison of senior exit and one-year follow-up surveys. This information is being used by stakeholder groups to shape improvement activities.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Improve systems administration and monitoring.</b> The SEA further analyzed data of students who	Contractor (SRI) completed analysis comparison of senior exit and one-year follow-up surveys. This information is being used by stakeholder	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-

Activity	Measureable Outcomes	Status / Next Steps
are not competitively employed or attending postsecondary to identify what they are doing, who they are, and needed supports.	groups to shape improvement activities.	2011)
<b>Improve systems administration and monitoring.</b> The SEA further analyzed postsecondary data to identify characteristics of attenders and nonattenders, postsecondary success and needed supports.	Contractor (SRI) completed analysis comparison of senior exit and one-year follow-up surveys. This information is being used by stakeholder groups to shape improvement activities.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Improve systems administration and monitoring.</b> The SEA further analyzed employment data to determine quality of employment and needed supports.	Contractor (SRI) completed analysis comparison of senior exit and one-year follow-up surveys. This information is being used by stakeholder groups to shape improvement activities.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> The SEA developed tools to increase AEA and LEA access to and use of data.	Deep analysis of data completed with five AEAs.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> The SEA developed tools and provided technical assistance to AEAs, LEAs, families, students, and Disability Support Services Providers to increase access to accommodations at the postsecondary level.	The percentage of students completing at least one term at a postsecondary institution increased from 86.7% to 87.8%.	Ongoing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)

*Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).* The analyses of FFY 2009 (2009-2010) data form the basis of discussion that follows.

The percentage of youth enrolled in some type of postsecondary school (Measure A) increased from the baseline of 25.70 to 34.09. This exceeds the target of 28.20%. The percentage of youth with IEPs enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (Measure B) also increased from the baseline of 48.65% to 53.03%. This exceeds the target of 49.65%. The percentage of youth enrolled in higher education or some other postsecondary education or training, or competitively employed in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (Measure C), however, decreased slightly from the baseline of 84.14% to 83.99%. This was lower than the target of 85.14%.

Further analysis of the data for Measures A and B indicated that the increases were the result of individuals shifting within the criteria of the measures themselves. This mirrors the focus of improvement activities. Measure A, for example, increased because more individuals went to a two year or four year college rather than adult education (16.6% in FFY 08 and 8.8% in FFY 09). Also, the percentage of individuals completing a term increased from 86.7% in FFY 08 to 87.8% in FFY 09. Previous improvement activities have emphasized the sharing of information between secondary and postsecondary settings. The percentage of people who were not engaged in education or employment within one year of leaving high school actual increased slightly from 15.86% to 16.01%.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010 (2010-2011):**

Proposed activities for FFY 2010 (2010-2011) are discussed in Table B14.10. Activities listed as ongoing in Table B14.9 will continue in FFY 2010 (2010-2011) and are not listed in Table B14.10.

Table B14.10  
Improvement Activities Proposed for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)

Proposed Activity	Proposed Personnel Resources	Proposed Timelines	Anticipated Outcomes
<b>Clarify/examine/develop policies and procedures.</b> Partner with other agencies and organizations to identify competitive employment definition similarities, differences and statewide needs.	DE transition consultant, IVRS, DD Council, other stakeholders Outside facilitator	FFY 2010	Identify state needs and develop state partnership goals.
<b>Clarify/examine/develop policies and procedures.</b> Send a team of stakeholder to the National Conference on Employment of Individuals with Autism .	DE Autism consultant, funds to support travel of up to 8 member team	FFY 201	Identify state needs and develop next steps.

*Revisions to Proposed Targets for FFY 2010 (2010-2011) through 2012 (2012-2013).*

Iowa's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) met to examine FFY 2009 (2009-2010) data for Indicator B14 and set targets for a two-year extension to the state's performance plan. The SEAP determined that targets for FFY 2010 (2010-2011) should also be revised to reflect state priorities and the most recent data. Proposed revisions are reflected in the table below.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2010 (2010-2011)</b>	<p><b>B14A: 32.20 percent of leavers will be enrolled in higher education.</b></p> <p><b>B14B: 53.65 percent of leavers will be enrolled in higher education or competitively employed.</b></p> <p><b>B14C: 86.14 percent of leavers will be enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment.</b></p>
<b>2011 (2011-2012)</b>	<p><b>B14A: 34.70 percent of leavers will be enrolled in higher education.</b></p> <p><b>B14B: 57.65 percent of leavers will be enrolled in higher education or competitively employed.</b></p> <p><b>B14C: 87.14 percent of leavers will be enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment.</b></p>
<b>2012 (2012-2013)</b>	<p><b>B14A: 38.70 percent of leavers will be enrolled in higher education.</b></p> <p><b>B14B: 61.65 percent of leavers will be enrolled in higher education or competitively employed.</b></p> <p><b>B14C: 88.14 percent of leavers will be enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment.</b></p>

## One-Year Follow-Up Survey Instrument

1-Year Follow-Up Survey  
FFY 2008 (2009-2010)

Q #	Text	Q Type	Response Criteria
Welcome:	<b>Thank you for taking this survey.</b> If you took the Senior Exit Survey last year before leaving school, you may remember that the Iowa State Department of Education is seeking information to improve students' transition to life after high school. All responses have been and will be kept completely confidential. No names will ever be used in our results.	Read Only	
1	<b>We are interested in how well you think your high school prepared you for your life after graduation.</b>	Text/HTML	
1a	How well do you think your high school experience has prepared you <b>to decide what you want to do after high school?</b>	4 Point Scale w/NA	
1b	How well do you think your high school experience has <b>informed you about possible careers and job opportunities?</b>	4 Point Scale w/NA	
1c	How well do you think your high school experience has prepared you <b>to find and keep a job?</b>	4 Point Scale w/NA	
1d	How well do you think your high school experience has prepared you <b>for further education?</b>	4 Point Scale w/NA	
1e	How well do you think your high school experience has prepared you <b>for living on your own?</b>	4 Point Scale w/NA	
1f	How well do you think your high school experience has prepared you <b>to manage your personal finances?</b>	4 Point Scale w/NA	
1g	How well do you think your high school experience has provided you with <b>specific job or occupational skills?</b>	4 Point Scale w/NA	
2	Did you graduate from high school with a diploma or have you completed a GED?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	High school diploma GED Did not receive high school diploma or GED

			Do not know
3a	Did you need any community or government assistance for further education, jobs, or living arrangements after you left high school?	Yes/No	
3b	What type of services did you need? (Check all that apply.)	Check Box List	Finding a job Getting job training Financial aide for further education Other support for further education Making living arrangements Special assistance for independent living Other
3c	Did you get the help or services that you needed?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	Yes, for all areas of need Yes, for some areas of need No
3d	Which reason best describes why you did not get the help?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	Services were not helpful Did not apply for services Did not qualify for services Do not know Other
3e	Who helped you find those services?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	I found it on my own Family member Friend High school teacher or other high school staff (such as guidance counselor, school social worker) Agency staff Other
4a	Do you currently need community or government assistance for further education, jobs, or living arrangements?	Yes/No	
4b	What type of services do you need? (Check all that apply)	Check Box List	Finding a job Getting job training Financial aide for further education Other support for further education Making living arrangements Special assistance for independent living
5	We are interested in your work history next. Since leaving high school, have you been employed in	Yes/No	

	any paid job?		
5a	Why have you not worked since leaving high school?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	Unable to find work Disabled In a mental health program Incarcerated (jail) Full-time homemaker/parent Student In job training Difficulties with transportation Other
5b	Since leaving high school, have you been employed for at least a 3-month period in the past 12 months?	Yes/No w/Comment	
5c	I'm going to ask you questions about the job that you were employed in for at least 3 months in the past 12 months. During that time did you make minimum wage, more than minimum wage, or less than minimum wage?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	Less than minimum wage Minimum wage More than minimum wage
5d	On average, how many hours per week did you work at that job?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	1 - 9 hours Over 9 but less than 20 hours At least 20 but less than 35 hours 35 or more hours
6	At that job, how many of the other workers had or have disabilities?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	None of them One or two of them Most of them Don't know
6a	As part of that job did or do you get <b>paid vacation</b> <u>and/or</u> <b>sick leave</b> ?	Yes/No	
6b	As part of that job did or do you get <b>health insurance</b> ?	Yes/No	
6c	As part of that job did or do you get <b>retirement benefits</b> ?	Yes/No	
6d	Which one of the following categories best describes the type of work you did or do at that job?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	Assembly or production Agriculture, Natural Resources Clerical or office work Construction Family and personal services, such as day care Health care Maintenance Military



			Recreation Fitness, Summer Recreation, Camps, Health Club
			Restaurant or food service
			Retail sales
			Other
7	Are you currently working outside the home for pay?	Yes/No	
7a	Did we just talk about that job? ( <b>NOTE:</b> If the survey has not yet asked questions about a specific job, say "no" to this question.)	Yes/No	
8	At your current job, do you make minimum wage, more than minimum, or less than minimum wage?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	Less than minimum wage
			Minimum wage
			More than minimum wage
8a	On average how many hours per week do you work at your current job?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	1 - 9 hours
			Over 9 but less than 20 hours
			At least 20 but less than 35 hours
			35 or more hours
8b	At your current job, how many of the other workers had or have disabilities?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	None of them
			One or two of them
			Most of them
			Don't know
8c	As part of your current job do you get <b>paid vacation</b> and/or <b>sick leave</b> ?	Yes/No	
8d	As part of your current job do you get <b>health insurance</b> ?	Yes/No	
8e	As part of your current job do you get <b>retirement benefits</b> ?	Yes/No	
8f	Which one of the following categories best describes the type of work you do at your current job?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	Assembly or production
			Agriculture, Natural Resources
			Clerical or office work
			Construction
			Family and personal services, such as day care
			Health care
			Maintenance
			Military
			Recreation Fitness, Summer Recreation, Camps, Health Club
			Restaurant or food service
			Retail sales
			Other
10	Why are you not currently working?	Multiple Choice/Single	Unable to find work
			Disabled

		Selection	In a mental health program
			Incarcerated (jail)
			Full-time homemaker/parent
			Student
			In job training
			Difficulties with transportation
			Other
11a	Tell me about the last job that you had. Were you making less than minimum wage, minimum wage, or more than minimum wage?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	Less than minimum wage
			Minimum wage
			More than minimum wage
11b	On average, how many hours per week did you work at that job?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	1 - 9 hours
			Over 9 but less than 20 hours
			At least 20 but less than 35 hours
			35 or more hours
11c	At your past job, how many of the other workers had disabilities?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	None of them
			One or two of them
			Don't know
12	How well do you get along with your boss(es)?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	Always have problems
			Often have problems
			Sometimes have problems
			Usually get along
			Always get along
13	How well do you get along with your co-workers?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	Always have problems
			Often have problems
			Sometimes have problems
			Usually get along
			Always get along
14	Would you consider any of the work you've had since leaving high school to meet your long-term work goal?	Yes/No w/Comment	
15	What are you planning to do to pursue your long-term employment goal?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	Look for another job
			Pursue education or training
			Work your way up to a higher position
			No long term employment goal
			Don't know
16a	Do you plan to attend school sometime in the future?	Yes/No	
16b	What is the highest level of education that you would like to obtain?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	High school diploma, GED
			License, certificate, or diploma from a technical, business or trade school
			Associate's degree/Bachelor's degree

			Associate's degree/Bachelor's degree
			Graduate degree (Master's, PhD, MD, etc.)
			No preference, Don't know
16c	Have you taken classes of any kind since you left high school?	Yes/No	
17	What type of school did you attend this past year?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	Public 4-year college or university
			Private 4-year college or university
			Public 2-year or community college
			Private 2-year college (e.g. private business or trade school)
			Other type of adult or community education
18a	Did you attend this school part-time or full-time?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	Part-time
			Full-time
18b	Did you complete at least one term at this school since leaving high school?	Yes/No w/Comment	
18c	Which one reason below best describes your objective in going to school?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	Degree or taking courses that can be used towards a degree (e.g., AA, BS, MS, Ed.D)
			Training Program Certificate (e.g., firefighters, teacher assistant)
			Military course work
			Work apprenticeship program
			Adult literacy program
			GED
			Coursework - not degree oriented – in an area of interest or hobby (e.g., language, photography, landscaping)
19	Which one of the following areas best describes your primary area of study or training?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	Agriculture, Natural Resources
			Arts and Communications
			Business, Computers, Marketing
			Education
			Engineering, Architecture, Industrial Technology
			Family and Personal Services
			Health Occupations
			Law, Government, Public Service
			Hospitality or Tourism
			Other
			Undecided / Don't Know
20	Item intentionally missing		

21	During the last few weeks, how have you spent most of your time when you weren't working or going to school? (Check all that apply.)	Check Box List	Visiting with family members Visiting with friends Talking with friends on the telephone Watching television or videos Listening to music Exercise, participate in sports or other athletic activity Other
22	During the past year, have you done any volunteer or community service activities? This could include community service that is part of a church or other group.	Yes/No	
23	Do you have a driver's license?	Yes/No	
24	Do you usually have money that you can decide how to spend?	Yes/No	
25	Do you have your own checking account?	Yes/No	
26	Do you have a savings account?	Yes/No	
27	Do you have a credit card or charge account in your own name?	Yes/No	
28	Do you earn enough to support yourself without financial help from your family or government benefit programs?	Yes/No	
29	Do you have medical insurance?	Yes/No	
30	During <b>most</b> of the past year, where did you live?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	In your own apartment/home With your family In student housing (such as a dormitory or residence hall) In an apartment or group residence that provides special assistance In military housing/barracks In another arrangement
31	During most of the past year, did you live in Iowa?	Yes/No	
32a	How happy are you with your life as a young adult? Would you say you are generally unhappy or generally happy?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	Generally Unhappy Generally happy
32b	Item intentionally missing		
32c	Why aren't you happy? Would you say it's due to . . .	Check Box List	Problems with work Problems with family Problems with friends Loneliness Problems with money

		Problems with health
		Boredom, not enough to do
		Other

## Dropout Survey Instrument

Dropout Survey  
FFY 2008 (2009-2010)

Q #	Text	Q Type	Response Criteria
Welcome:	<b>Thank you for taking this survey.</b> The results are designed to help the State Department of Education improve students' transition to life after high school. Your responses will be kept completely confidential.	Read Only	
1	<b>Have you participated in any of the following types of school activities during the past 2 years?</b>	Text/HTML	
1a	School clubs, such as debate, student government, or environmental clubs?	Yes/No/NA	
1b	Athletic activities, such as varsity sports, intramurals, or cheerleading?	Yes/No/NA	
1c	Performing groups, such as band, choir, dance, or drill team?	Yes/No/NA	
1d	School drama activities, including acting, working on sets, lighting, costumes or publicity?	Yes/No/NA	
1e	Have you participated in any other school-sponsored extra-curricular activities during the past 2 years?	Yes/No/NA	
2	During high school have you ever participated in any career-oriented events such as interest inventories, career or job fairs, or college recruitment events?	Yes/No/NA	
3	During the past year, have you talked with a guidance counselor or another adult at your school about your plans for the future?	Yes/No/NA	

4	During the past year, have you done any volunteer or community service activities? This could include community service that is part of a school class or other group.	Yes/No/NA	
5	<b>The next set of questions ask about how well you think your high school has prepared you for your life after high school. Please indicate one response for each item.</b>	Text/HTML	
5a	How well do you think your high school experience has prepared you <b>to decide what you want to do after high school?</b>	4 Point Scale w/NA	
5b	How well do you think your high school experience has <b>informed you about possible careers and job opportunities?</b>	4 Point Scale w/NA	
5c	How well do you think your high school experience has prepared you <b>to find and keep a job?</b>	4 Point Scale w/NA	
5d	How well do you think your high school experience has prepared you <b>for further education?</b>	4 Point Scale w/NA	
5e	How well do you think your high school experience has prepared you <b>for living on your own?</b>	4 Point Scale w/NA	
5f	How well do you think your high school experience has prepared you <b>to manage your personal finances?</b>	4 Point Scale w/NA	
5g	How well do you think your high school experience has provided you with <b>specific job or occupational skills?</b>	4 Point Scale w/NA	
6	<b>By the time you graduate will you have taken at least:</b>	Text/HTML	
6a	1 year of Algebra, or equivalent	Yes/No/NA	
6b	4 years of English?	Yes/No/NA	
6c	3 years of science?	Yes/No/NA	
6d	3 years of social studies?	Yes/No/NA	
6e	3 years of math? (may or may not include 1 year of Algebra)	Yes/No/NA	

# Part B APR FFY 2009 (2009-2010)

IOWA

7a	During high school, did you take courses to help prepare you for employment after high school?	Yes/No/NA	
7b	In what areas were the classes you took? (Check all that apply.)	Check Box List	
8a	Do you think you will need any community or government assistance for further education, jobs, or living arrangements?	Yes/No/NA	
8b	What type of services? (Check all that apply.)	Check Box List	<div>Finding a job</div> <div>Getting job training</div> <div>Financial aid for further education</div> <div>Other support for further education</div> <div>Making living arrangements</div> <div>Special assistance to live independently</div> <div>Other</div>
9a	In the past 2 years, have you taken part in any school-sponsored work activities, like a work experience job, an internship, or a school-based business?	Yes/No/NA	
9b	Did you get school credit for any of that work?	Yes/No	
9c	Did you get paid for that work?	Yes/No	
10a	Do you currently have a job? (A paying job, not including work around the house.)	Yes/No/NA	
10b	Have you had a paying job in the past 2 years?	Yes/No/NA	
11	How long have you been working at this job?	Multiple Choice / Single Selection	<div>Less than 6 months (since December 2009)</div> <div>6 months to one year (since May 2009)</div> <div>More than 1 year (before May 2009)</div>
11a	How much do you currently make relative to the minimum wage of \$7.25/hr?	Multiple Choice/ Single Selection	<div>Less than minimum wage</div> <div>Minimum wage</div> <div>More than minimum wage</div>
12	Did you find this job on your own or	Multiple Choice / Single	Found job on my own.

	did you have some help, either from someone you know, your school, or a job-related program?	Selection	Help from someone I know
			Help from school or job-related program
13	Which one of the following categories best describes the type of work you do at this job?	Drop Down	Assembly or production, such as mechanic
			Agriculture, Natural Resources
			Clerical or office work
			Construction
			Family and personal services, such as cosmetology, day care or housekeeping
			Health care
			Maintenance, recycling
			Recreation Fitness, Summer Recreation, Camps, Health Club
			Restaurant or food service
			Retail sales, such as grocery or clothing
			Other
14	Do you have a driver's license?	Yes/No/NA	
15	Do you usually have money that you can decide how to spend?	Yes/No/NA	
16	Do you have your own checking account?	Yes/No/NA	
17	Do you have a savings account?	Yes/No/NA	
18	Do you have a credit card or charge account in your name?	Yes/No/NA	
19	What is the highest level of education that you would like to obtain?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	High school diploma
			License, certificate or diploma from a technical, business or trade school
			Associate's degree
			Bachelor's degree
			Graduate degree (MA, MS, PhD, MD, EdD)
			Don't know



20a	What are your educational plans for this fall?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	
20b	Which one of the following will be your <i>primary</i> area of study or training?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	<div>Agriculture, Natural Resources</div> <div>Arts and Communications</div> <div>Business, Computers, Marketing</div> <div>Education</div> <div>Engineering, Architecture, Industrial Technology, Auto Mechanics</div> <div>Family and Personal Services (hair design, athletic trainer)</div> <div>Health Occupations</div> <div>Law, Government, Public Service</div> <div>Hospitality or Tourism</div> <div>Other</div> <div>Undecided (Don't know)</div>
21	What are your work plans for this fall?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	<div>Work part-time</div> <div>Work full time</div> <div>In the Military</div> <div>No work plans this fall</div> <div>Full time homemaker</div>
22	What state do you plan to live in this fall?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	<div>In Iowa</div> <div>Not in Iowa</div>
23	What will be your living arrangement this fall?	Multiple Choice/Single Selection	<div>Live in student housing (dormitory, residence hall)</div> <div>Live in/rent apartment, house</div> <div>Live with family</div> <div>Live in an apartment or group residence that provides assistance</div> <div>Live in some other arrangement</div> <div>Military Housing</div>
23b	Describe your living arrangements for next fall:		Text Box Large
24	Will you receive your high school diploma in the spring or summer of 2010?		Yes/No/Don't Know

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

The Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) was developed by State Education Agency (SEA) staff reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these components and comments were compiled. AEA and District noncompliance data were analyzed with the following key stakeholders: Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Statewide Area Education Agency (AEA) Monitoring Workgroup, and the Iowa Department of Education staff.

In the FFY 2008 (2008-2009) Response Letter from OSEP, for Indicator 15, the OSEP Analysis/Next Steps were summarized as:

*In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.*

*In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.*

*In responding to Indicators 11 and 12 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.*

Hence, in this APR, the SEA will (a) report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., has achieved 100% compliance), (b) report that all individual noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 has been corrected, (c) describe the specific actions taken to verify the correction of noncompliance, (d) use the Indicator 15 Worksheet, (e) report on the correction of noncompliance for Indicators 11 and 12 described in this table in those indicator sections.

The SEA will report to the public progress/and or slippage in meeting the “measurable and rigorous targets” found in the SPP/APR by posting on the State of Iowa Department of Education website ([http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592)) sometime after Feb 1, 2011 but no later than April 1, 2011, the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) APR submitted to OSEP. Any changes to the SPP accepted by OSEP will be posted within 30 days of receipt of the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) response letter to Iowa expected for receipt prior to July 1, 2011.

Performance of AEAs and LEAs on appropriate indicators will be posted by June 1, 2011. AEA profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590). District profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591). Iowa's Accountability Workbook is available at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308).

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Indicator 15:** General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a) (3) (B))

The following measurement for this indicator was a requirement of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) for both the six-year State Performance Plan and each Annual Performance Report.

**Measurement:**

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

States are required to use the "Indicator 15 Worksheet" to report data for this indicator.

**Measurable and Rigorous Target:**

The provision of effective general supervision and the identification and correction of noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification is a compliance indicator and OSEP designated the measurable and rigorous target at 100%. Each annual target of the six-year State Performance Plan is set at 100%.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009 (2009-2010)	<b>General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification 100% of the time.</b>

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

Data reported below are generated from Iowa's Information Management System for Special Education (IMS), Iowa's Monitoring Database, on-site visits, and Iowa's due process database. Data have been verified and determined valid and reliable for noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 (2008-2009) and corrected in FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Identification and correction of district noncompliance was monitored by AEAs and the SEA. During FFY 2008 (2008-2009), each district identified for a site visit in the subsequent school year used a statewide self-assessment tool to conduct IEP file reviews on a random sample using a 95% confidence level with a 10% margin of error. Districts engaging in a site visit during FFY 2008 (2008-2009) were also reviewed for noncompliance. Iowa also generates a report of noncompliance from compliance data collected in Iowa's Information Management System (IMS) annually. Table B15.1 reports the total number of findings of noncompliance identified during FFY 2008 (2008-2009) through site visits, self-assessment, desk audits, data reports, and due process proceedings and corrected within one year of identification.

**Timely Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):**

25. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009) (Sum of Column a on the Indicator B15 Worksheet)	<b>7487</b>
26. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding) (Sum of Column b on the Indicator B15 Worksheet)	<b>7440</b>
27. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	<b>47</b>

**FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):**

28. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	<b>47</b>
29. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	<b>0</b>
30. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	<b>47</b>

**Table B15.1**  
**State Total Findings of Noncompliance in**  
**FFY 2008 (2008-2009) and Percent Corrected Within One Year**

<b>Indicator/Indicator Clusters</b>	<b>General Supervision System Components</b>	<b># of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)</b>	<b>(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)</b>	<b>(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification</b>
1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.				
14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	71	2503	2474
7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes.				
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
4A. Percent of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	6	7	7
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
4B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0


Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.				
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 -educational placements.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	70	1145	1136
6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 – early childhood placement.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	63	285	285
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	1	1	1
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	10	195	195
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit,	6	49	49

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 (7/1/07 to 6/30/08)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
implemented by their third birthdays.	On-Site Visits, or Other			
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable student to meet the post-secondary goals.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	68	3302	3302
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
<b>Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b</b>			7487	7440
<b>Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.</b>			<b>(b) / (a) X 100 =</b>	99.37

Source. FFY 2008 (2008-2009): SEA Monitoring Database, Site Visit Reports, Desk Audits, Due Process Database.

As summarized in Table B15.1, there were 7487 findings of noncompliance identified statewide through onsite visits, self-assessments, desk audits, data reports, and due process procedures. Of the 7487 total findings, 7440 or 99.37 percent were corrected no later than one year from identification. Correction of these findings was verified by the SEA.

For FFY 2006 (2006-2007) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010), the percentage of findings identified and corrected no later than one year from identification is summarized in Figure B15.1.



**Figure B15.1. State Percent of Identified Noncompliance Corrected No Later than One Year from Identification.** *Source: SEA Monitoring Database, FFY 2006 (2006-2007) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).*

Iowa did not meet the measureable and rigorous target of 100% for Indicator 15 for FFY 2009 (2009-2010), with 99.37% of findings corrected and correction verified no later than one year from identification. Iowa did meet substantial compliance of greater than 95%.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

Discussion of Improvement Activities That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Meeting targets for each indicator in the SPP is a priority for Iowa, and resources have been committed to each indicator and across indicators, to impact actual target data for each FFY on which performance is reported.

Consistent with activities documented in the SPP, several improvement activities were implemented to impact meeting the targets for this indicator. While activities have not changed, the headings used to describe each activity were changed to match the Improvement Activity headings in the APR Checklists.

Improvement activities, Measureable Outcomes, and Status/Next Steps are summarized in Table B15.2.



**Table B15.2**  
**Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

Improvement Activity	Measurable Outcomes	Status/Next Steps
<b>Improve data collection and reporting.</b> Compliance items within I-STAR will be updated as needed based on any new OSEP requirements.	SEA adapted web-based file review tool to collect data as needed to fulfill OSEP requirements for two-prong verification of noncompliance correction.	Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> The SEA and AEA stakeholder group will provide training to LEAs on I-STAR updates related to OSEP requirements.	LEAs were provided training to understand I-STAR changes to ensure accurate data collection.	Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)
<b>Improve data collection and reporting.</b> I-STAR file reviews will be conducted two years prior to LEA School Improvement site visits to focus on maintenance of compliance after correction.	Part B file review was moved to two years prior to School Improvement site visits to allow the SEA to monitor continued procedural compliance after correction of noncompliance identified through I-STAR.	Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)

*Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).* The analyses of data form the basis of discussion that follows.

Iowa did not meet the measurable and rigorous state target for percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification, with actual target data reported for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) being 99.37%. SEA personnel attribute slippage on Indicator 15 to the fact that FFY 2009 (2009-2010) was the first year during which the SEA fully implemented the guidance in OSEP Memorandum 09-02 regarding the second prong of verification of correction of noncompliance. The state's efforts to verify that LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e. had achieved 100% compliance in subsequent sampling) were fully in place in FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and resulted in 35 districts failing to meet this requirement. While all individual noncompliance continued to be corrected to 100%, 47 findings remained open after subsequent sampling revealed that compliance was not yet at 100% in these districts.

**Verification of Correction for findings of noncompliance reported in the FFY 2009 APR (either timely or subsequent):**

Iowa analyzed data from all components of the general supervision system, including on-site visits, self-assessments, desk audits, data reports, and dispute resolution. Data are collected from AEAs and Districts through on site visits and self-assessments on a five-year monitoring cycle. Each year 40% of Districts, 40% of AEAs, and 20% of separate facilities participate in some form of monitoring activity, and over a five year cycle 100% of programs in the state are monitored through an on-site visit and self-assessment. In FFY 2008 (2008-2009), a total of 78 programs were monitored through the state monitoring cycle, and all programs were monitored through the state data system. Compliance data related to indicators 9, 11, and 12 are collected in the states Information Management System (IMS) and used to issue findings of noncompliance annually. Data on complaints and hearings are collected in the state's Dispute Resolution database.

The SEA determined that noncompliance cited in FFY 2008 (2008-2009) was occurring because (a) many AEA and district personnel are not yet aware of the requirement to meet 100% compliance in subsequent sampling and still rely on the ability to correct noncompliance when cited rather than achieving higher levels of compliance initially, and (b) levels of compliance with IEP requirements for transition age students remain low in some areas. To remedy this, the SEA has undertaken initiatives to (a) increase understanding of general supervision and monitoring requirements by AEAs and (b) provide additional, targeted support for secondary transition personnel in AEAs and districts.

Iowa verified the correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 (2008-2009) by (a) verifying that all individual, child-specific noncompliance was corrected to 100% via the state's ISTAR and Web IEP systems, and (b) verifying that each LEA that was performing below 100% compliance in FFY 2008 (2008-2009) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by reviewing a sample of IEPs from a subsequent time period. Verification of correction of individual noncompliance (Prong 1) occurs in the ISTAR system and state data system in two ways. First, the AEA verifies that for child-specific noncompliance has been corrected at the district and/or AEA level. Then the SEA verifies the same information on the IEP and in the statewide data system. Child-specific noncompliance is considered "verified" when both steps have been completed. Verification of correct implementation of the regulatory requirement (Prong 2) is done by analyzing updated data or reviewing more IEPs in a sample from the subsequent to the period during which the noncompliance was found but within the one year correction period. To be determined to be correctly implementing the regulatory requirement an LEA is required to meet 100% compliance in a sample of three new IEPs. The time period examined begins six months from notification of findings of noncompliance and ends three months later.

### Actions Taken if Noncompliance Not Corrected

While Iowa was able to verify correction of all noncompliance for FFY 2008 (2008-2009), the state has procedures in place should timely correction not take place in the future. Iowa's Administrative Rules of Special Education provide the SEA with the latitude to take enforcement actions in cases of noncompliance with the IDEA, including, but not limited to, requiring a corrective action plan, withholding payments under Part B, and referring the matter for enforcement to the department of justice or state auditor. [IAC 281-41.604]

### Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010 (2010-2011):

Proposed activities for FFY 2010 (2010-2011) are summarized in Table B15.3. These activities are consistent with what was proposed in the FFY 2004 (2004-2011) State Performance Plan and describe activities to be implemented in FFY 2010 (2010-2011) that will allow Iowa to meet measureable and rigorous targets for both FFY 2010 (2010-2011) and the targets continuing in the SPP through FFY 2012 (2012-2013).

(Note: Activities listed as ongoing in Table B15.2 will continue in FFY 2009 (2009-2010), and are not listed in Table B15.3).

**Table B15.3**  
**Proposed Activities for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**

Proposed Activity	Proposed Personnel Resources	Proposed Timelines	Anticipated Outcomes
<b>Improve data collection and reporting.</b> Compliance items within I-STAR will be updated as needed based on any new OSEP requirements.	1 SEA consultant	July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011	SEA will adapt web-based file review tool to collect data as needed to fulfill any new OSEP requirements.
<b>Provide technical assistance.</b> The SEA and AEA stakeholder group will provide training to LEAs on general supervision updates related to OSEP requirements.	1 SEA consultant and stakeholder group	July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011	LEAs will understand monitoring and general supervision changes to ensure accurate data collection.
<b>Improve data collection and reporting.</b> The requirement for verification of correction of Prong 2, i.e. that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement, will be programmed into Iowa's I-STAR system.	2 SEA consultants, contractors	July 1, 2010-June 30, 2012	Data on the second prong of verification of correction will be valid and reliable.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

The Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) was developed by State Education Agency (SEA) staff reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included the State Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Area Education Agency (AEA) administration, the Iowa Department of Education staff, special education administrative law judges, and state-contracted special education mediators.

Consistent with comments in the FFY 2008 (2008-2009) Response Letter from OSEP, for Indicator 16, the SEA will report on progress or slippage on the required measurement, on improvement activities described in the State Performance Plan that were implemented in FFY 2009 (2009-2010), the outcomes of improvement activities implemented in FFY 2009 (2009-2010), and changes to improvement activities to be reported on for FFY 2010 (2010-2011).

While Indicators B16, B17, B18, and B19 deal with proceedings around Effective General Supervision, the Improvement Activities, many of which cross indicators, will be summarized with the Indicator to which activities best aligned.

In addition, Indicators B16, B17, B18, and B19 address formal dispute resolution required in IDEA. Historically, Iowa has been committed to having preventative activities in place so that parents, educators, and other individuals involved with the educational community have practices, procedures, and capacity in place to resolve differences without resorting to formal dispute resolution. All state mediators and administrative law judges have been trained in conflict resolution and assist with collaborative problem solving so that formal disputes may be prevented. Iowa has also accessed technical assistance centers such as the Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE), for support with comparative data and on improvement activities. Because of the targeted nature of the SPP and APR in reporting specifically on measurement, some of the preventative work may go unnoticed. Hence, this preventative paradigm is reflected in the overview of APR development in that Iowa works diligently to prevent disputes from escalating to the level of formal dispute resolution, and the impact of the preventative efforts is reflected in Iowa's Actual Target Data for Indicators B16, B17, B18, and B19.

The SEA will report to the public progress/and or slippage in meeting the "measurable and rigorous targets" found in the SPP/APR by posting on the State of Iowa Department of Education website

([http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592)) sometime after Feb 1, 2011 but no later than April 1, 2011, the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) APR submitted to OSEP. Any changes to the SPP accepted by OSEP will be posted within 30 days of receipt of the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) response letter to Iowa expected for receipt prior to July 1, 2011.

Performance of AEAs and LEAs on appropriate indicators will be posted by June 1, 2011. AEA profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590).

District profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591).

Iowa's Accountability Workbook is available at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308).

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**

**Indicator 16:** Percent of signed written complaints with reports<sup>3</sup> issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances<sup>4</sup> with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a) (3) (B))

The following measurement for this indicator was a requirement of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) for both the six-year State Performance Plan and each Annual Performance Report. The measurement is derived specifically from data included in 618 Table 7.

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by (1.1)] times 100.

Percent = Number of complaints with reports issued within timelines + number of complaints with reports issued within extended timelines divided by number of complaints with reports issued times 100.

**Measurable and Rigorous Target:**

Indicator 16 (percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint) is a compliance indicator and OSEP designated the measurable and rigorous target at 100%. Each annual target of the six-year State Performance Plan is set at 100%.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2009 (2009-2010)</b>	<b>100% of signed written complaints with reports issued were resolved within a 60-day timeline, or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</b>


<sup>3</sup> OSEP used the language, “reports issued that were resolved” to mean that “A written decision was provided by the SEA to the complainant and public agency regarding alleged violations of a requirement of Part B of IDEA.” (618 Table 7 Instructions)

<sup>4</sup> OSEP requires each state to define “exceptional circumstances” in its procedures. Iowa included these examples:

- (1) The unavailability of necessary parties or information may hinder the investigation;
- (2) Either the agency or the complainant submits additional data that changes the course of the investigation; or
- (3) The complainant submits large volumes of additional information on a later date making it impossible to review and stay within the timeline.

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

Figure B16.1 shows the State Education Agency's (SEA) baseline and annual performance through FFY 2009 (2009-2010), and the target for the percent of signed written complaints with reports within the required timeline for complaints received between July 1, 2009, and June 30, 2010.



**Figure B16.1. Percent of Iowa Complaints Meeting Timelines for FFY 2004 – FFY 2009.** Source. Iowa Department of Education Complaint Data Reports, FFY 2004 (2004-2005) - FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

As shown in Figure B16.1, the State target was met for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Results of data indicated the SEA maintained the OSEP target of 100% from baseline through the fifth year's target.

Table B16.1 shows the number of complaint occurrences and timelines of SEA data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Data for Indicator 16 are reflected in Section A of 618 Table 7. The data in Table 7 match the data in this report, and the SEA is not required to explain any discrepancies in the data.

**Table B16.1**  
**Formal Complaints and Timelines for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

Due Process Description	Total Number
<b>(1) Complaints Filed</b>	<b>13</b>
(1.1) Complaints Investigated With Reports Issued	7
(a) Reports With Findings of Noncompliance (5)	
(b) Reports Within Timeline of 60 Calendar Days (1)	
(c) Reports Within Allowed Extended Timelines (6)	
(1.2) Complaints Pending	2
(a) Complaint Pending a Due Process Hearing (0)	
(1.3) Complaints Withdrawn or Dismissed	4
Measurement = $((1.1b + 1.1c)/1.1) * 100 = [(1+6)/7] * 100$	100%

*Source. Iowa Department of Education, Bureau of Student and Family Support Services, Bureau Data: Complaints FFY 2009 (2009-2010).*

The SEA has met the requirements of Indicator B16 for FFY 2009 (2009-2010), with 100% of signed written complaints with reports issued being resolved within a 60-day timeline, or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

#### **Description of Corrective Actions Taken by the SEA:**

Because the performance reflected in the Actual Target Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) is at 100%, the SEA did not implement corrective actions for Indicator 16. Improvement activities are summarized in the section that follows.

#### **Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

Discussion of Improvement Activities That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Meeting targets for each indicator in the SPP is a priority for Iowa. Resources have been committed to each indicator, and across indicators, in order to impact actual target data for each FFY on which performance is reported.

Improvement Activities, Measureable Outcomes, and Status/Next Steps are summarized in Table B16.2.

**Table B16.2**  
**Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

Improvement Activity	Measurable Outcomes	Status/Next Steps
<b>Improve data collection and reporting.</b> The SEA maintains a data system and has procedures to document and track complaints filed including monitoring of timelines and results.	Data for analysis and reporting are reliable and valid.	Ongoing for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and continuing annually through FFY 2010 (2010-2011).
<b>Clarify/examine/develop policies and procedures.</b> The SEA revised parts of the complaint procedures that have been unique to Iowa.	Appearance of a conflict of interest has been eliminated	The current complaint process has been updated and improved.

*Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).* The analyses of data form the basis of discussion that follows.

The actual target data obtained for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) reflected that Iowa met the state target of 100% for percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

In addition to the effect of the improvement activities listed in Table B16.2, the SEA attributes maintenance in part to: (a) Iowa's commitment to resolving conflicts as early as possible before a situation escalates into a formal dispute, (b) technical assistance received from CADRE regarding dispute prevention and effective resolution strategies, and (c) strong collaboration with Iowa's Parent-Educator Connection (PEC) which provide families of children and youth with disabilities with information and resources that enable effective conflict resolution with schools and AEAs.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010 (2010-2011):**

Proposed activities for FFY 2010 (2010-2011) are discussed in Table B16.3. These activities are consistent with what was proposed in the FFY 2004 (2004-2011) State Performance Plan and describe activities to be implemented in FFY 2010 (2010-2011). These activities will allow Iowa to meet measureable and rigorous targets for both FFY 2010 (2010-2011) and the targets continuing in the SPP through FFY 2012 (2012-2013). (Note: Activities listed as ongoing in Table B16.2 will continue in FFY 2010 (2010-2011), and are not listed in Table B16.3).

**Table B16.3**  
**Proposed Activities for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)**

Proposed Activity	Proposed Personnel Resources	Proposed Timelines	Anticipated Outcomes
<b>Improve Systems Administration and Monitoring.</b> The SEA is considering adding more complaint investigators.	3 SEA staff	July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011	More complaint investigators will be available to address concerns.

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

The Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) was developed by State Education Agency (SEA) staff reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included the State Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Area Education Agency (AEA) administration, the Iowa Department of Education staff, special education administrative law judges, and state-contracted special education mediators.

Consistent with comments in the FFY 2008 (2008-2009) Response Letter from OSEP, for Indicator 17, the SEA will report on progress or slippage on the required measurement, on improvement activities described in the State Performance Plan that were implemented in FFY 2009 (2009-2010), the outcomes of improvement activities implemented in FFY 2009 (2009-2010), and changes to improvement activities to be reported on for FFY 2010 (2010-2011).

While Indicators B16, B17, B18, and B19 deal with proceedings around Effective General Supervision, the Improvement Activities, many of which cross indicators, will be summarized with the Indicator to which activities best aligned.

In addition, Indicators B16, B17, B18, and B19 address formal dispute resolution required in IDEA. Historically, Iowa has been committed to having preventative activities in place so that parents, educators, and other individuals involved with the educational community have practices, procedures, and capacity in place to resolve differences without resorting to formal dispute resolution. All state mediators and administrative law judges have been trained in conflict resolution and assist with collaborative problem solving so that formal disputes may be prevented. Iowa has also accessed technical assistance centers such as the Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE), for support with comparative data and on improvement activities. Because of the targeted nature of the SPP and APR in reporting specifically on measurement, some of the preventative work may go unnoticed. Hence, this preventative paradigm is reflected in the overview of APR development in that Iowa works diligently to prevent disputes from escalating to the level of formal dispute resolution, and the impact of the preventative efforts is reflected in Iowa's Actual Target Data for Indicators B16, B17, B18, and B19.

The SEA will report to the public progress/and or slippage in meeting the "measurable and rigorous targets" found in the SPP/APR by posting on the State of Iowa Department of Education website

([http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592)) sometime after Feb 1, 2011 but no later than April 1, 2011, the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) APR submitted to OSEP. Any changes to the SPP accepted by OSEP will be posted within 30 days of receipt of the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) response letter to Iowa expected for receipt prior to July 1, 2011.

Performance of AEAs and LEAs on appropriate indicators will be posted by June 1, 2011. AEA profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590).

District profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591).

Iowa's Accountability Workbook is available at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308).



**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision**

**Indicator 17:** Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer<sup>5</sup> at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a) (3) (B))

The following measurement for this indicator was a requirement of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) for both the six-year State Performance Plan and each Annual Performance Report. The measurement is derived specifically from Section C of 618 Table 7.

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by (3.2)] times 100.

Percent = Number of hearing decisions within timeline + decisions within extended timeline divided by hearings held times 100.

**Measurable and Rigorous Target:**


For Indicator 17 (percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer<sup>1</sup> at the request of either party), the provision of due process hearings is a compliance indicator and OSEP designated the measurable and rigorous target at 100%. Each annual target of the six-year State Performance Plan is set at 100%.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2009 (2009-2010)</b>	100% of adjudicated due process hearing requests were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

Figure B17.1 shows the State Education Agency's (SEA) baseline and actual target data for each FFY through FFY 2009 (2009-2010), and the measurable and rigorous target for each FFY as reported in the SPP.

<sup>5</sup> In Iowa, an administrative law judge (ALJ), instead of a "hearing officer," is the person responsible for conducting a due process hearing.



**Figure B17.1. Percent of Iowa Fully Adjudicated Due Process Hearings That Met Timelines for Baseline and First and Second Years' Target from FFY 2004 (2004-2005) through FFY 2009 (2009-2010).** *Source. Iowa Department of Education Hearing Request Data Reports, FFY 2004 (2004-2005) - FFY 2009 (2009-2010).*

As depicted in Figure B17.1, actual target data for Indicator 17 for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) reflect that Iowa met the target of 100%.

Table B17.1 reports the number of due process hearing requests and timelines for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Data for Indicator 17 are reflected in Section C of 618 Table 7. The data in Table 7 match the data in this report, and the SEA is not required to explain any discrepancies in the data.

**Table B17.1**  
**Fully Adjudicated Hearings and Decisions Within Timelines, FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

Due Process Description	Number Reported (2009-2010)
(3.2) Hearings Fully Adjudicated	1
(a) Decisions within timeline	0
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	1
Measurement= (3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by (3.2) times 100.	$((0+1)/1)*100$ 100%

Source. Iowa Department of Education Hearing Request Data Reports, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

#### **Description of Corrective Actions Taken by the SEA:**

Because the performance reflected in the Actual Target Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) is at 100%, the SEA did not implement corrective actions for Indicator 17. Improvement activities are summarized in the section that follows.

#### **Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

Discussion of Improvement Activities That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Meeting targets for each indicator in the SPP is a priority for Iowa. Resources have been committed to each indicator, and across indicators, in order to impact actual target data for each FFY on which performance is reported.

Improvement Activities, Measureable Outcomes, and Status/Next Steps are summarized in Table B17.2.

**Table B17.2**  
**Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

Improvement Activity	Measurable Outcomes	Status/Next Steps
<b>Improve data collection and reporting.</b> The SEA maintained a data system and had procedures to document and track due process hearings filed including monitoring of timelines and results.	Data for analysis and reporting are reliable and valid.	Ongoing for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and annually through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Provide Technical assistance.</b> The SEA provided quarterly in-services to all mediators and administrative law judges on State policies and procedures.	Administrative law judges and mediators were trained in how to implement State policy and procedures.	Ongoing for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and annually through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Clarify/examine/develop policies and procedures.</b> Due process complaint (hearing) guidelines were revised. SEA staff updated the website to include updated guidelines and past postings of full decisions. The <i>School Leader Update</i> was also used to communicate hearing decisions.	Information disseminated to the field reflected current guidelines and hearing decisions.	Ongoing for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and annually through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)

*Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).* The analyses of data form the basis of discussion that follows. Iowa's met the measurable and rigorous target for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) with 100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

In FFY 2008 (2008-2009) there were no hearings held in Iowa, so the SEA cannot discuss progress or slippage.

In addition to the effect of the improvement activities listed in Table B17.2, the SEA attributes maintenance in part to: (a) Iowa's commitment to resolving conflicts as early as possible before a situation escalates into a formal dispute, (b) technical assistance received from CADRE regarding dispute prevention and effective resolution strategies, and (c) strong collaboration with Iowa's Parent-Educator Connection (PEC) which provide families of children and youth with disabilities with information and resources that enable effective conflict resolution with schools and AEAs.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010 (2010-2011):**

No revisions are proposed for FFY 2010 (2010-2011).

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

The Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) was developed by State Education Agency (SEA) staff reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included the state Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Area Education Agency (AEA) administration, the Iowa Department of Education staff, special education administrative law judges, and state-contracted special education mediators.

In the FFY 2008 (2008-2009) Response Letter from OSEP, for Indicator 18, OSEP stated:

*The state is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.*

Since fewer than ten resolution sessions have been held each year since the development of the State Performance Plan and fewer than ten resolution sessions were held in FFY 2009 (2009-2010), the SEA will not provide targets or improvement activities for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) for Indicator 18.

The SEA will report to the public progress/and or slippage in meeting the “measurable and rigorous targets” found in the SPP/APR by posting on the State of Iowa Department of Education website ([http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592)) sometime after Feb 1, 2011 but no later than April 1, 2011, the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) APR submitted to OSEP. Any changes to the SPP accepted by OSEP will be posted within 30 days of receipt of the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) response letter to Iowa expected for receipt prior to July 1, 2011.

Performance of AEAs and LEAs on appropriate indicators will be posted by June 1, 2011. AEA profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590). District profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591). Iowa's Accountability Workbook is available at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308).

<b>Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision</b>
--

**Indicator 18:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

The measurement is derived specifically from rows included in 618 Table 7.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

<b>Measurement:</b>
---------------------

Percent = 3.1(a) divided by (3.1) times 100.
--

Percent = Number of resolution session settlement agreements reached divided by number of resolution sessions held times 100.
---

**Baseline Data:**

Because Iowa has yet to have a FFY in any SPP to-date, with 10 or more resolution meetings, Iowa is not required to report baseline data.

**Measurable and Rigorous Target:**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009 (2009-2010)	Not Applicable.*

**\*Note. Part B State Performance Plan Indicator Measurement Table provided by OSEP indicated: "States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10."**

**Actual Target Data:**

No resolution sessions were held in FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Data for Indicator 18 are reflected in Section C of 618 Table 7. The data in Table 7 match the data in this report, and the SEA is not required to explain any discrepancies in the data. The SEA is not required to establish baseline or targets, since Iowa had fewer than 10 resolution meetings for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

The Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) was developed by State Education Agency (SEA) staff reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included the state Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Area Education Agency (AEA) administration, the Iowa Department of Education staff, special education administrative law judges, and state-contracted special education mediators.

Consistent with comments in the FFY 2008 (2008-2009) Response Letter from OSEP, for Indicator 19, the SEA will report on progress or slippage on the required measurement, on improvement activities described in the State Performance Plan that were implemented in FFY 2009 (2009-2010), the outcomes of improvement activities implemented in FFY 2009 (2009-2010), and changes to improvement activities to be reported on for FFY 2010 (2010-2011).

While Indicators B16, B17, B18, and B19 deal with proceedings around Effective General Supervision, the Improvement Activities, many of which cross indicators, will be summarized with the Indicator to which activities best aligned.

In addition, Indicators B16, B17, B18, and B19 address formal dispute resolution required in IDEA. Historically, Iowa has been committed to having preventative activities in place so that parents, educators, and other individuals involved with the educational community have practices, procedures, and capacity in place to resolve differences without resorting to formal dispute resolution. All state mediators and administrative law judges have been trained in conflict resolution and assist with collaborative problem solving so that formal disputes may be prevented. Iowa has also accessed technical assistance centers such as the Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE), for support with comparative data and on improvement activities. Because of the targeted nature of the SPP and APR in reporting specifically on measurement, some of the preventative work may go unnoticed. Hence, this preventative paradigm is reflected in the overview of APR development in that Iowa works diligently to prevent disputes from escalating to the level of formal dispute resolution, and the impact of the preventative efforts is reflected in Iowa's Actual Target Data for Indicators B16, B17, B18, and B19.

The SEA will report to the public progress/and or slippage in meeting the "measurable and rigorous targets" found in the SPP/APR by posting on the State of Iowa Department of Education website ([http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592)) sometime after Feb 1, 2011 but no later than April 1, 2011, the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) APR submitted to OSEP. Any changes to the SPP accepted by OSEP will be posted within 30 days of receipt of the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) response letter to Iowa expected for receipt prior to July 1, 2011.

Performance of AEAs and LEAs on appropriate indicators will be posted by June 1, 2011. AEA profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590). District profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591). Iowa's Accountability Workbook is available at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308).

<b>Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision</b>
--

**Indicator 19:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a) (3) (B))

The following measurement for this indicator was a requirement of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) for both the six year State Performance Plan and each Annual Performance Report. The measurement is derived specifically from Section B of 618 Table 7.

<p><b>Measurement:</b></p> <p>Percent = [(2.1(a) (i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by (2.1)] times 100.</p> <p>Percent = Number of mediation agreements related to due process complaints + number of mediation agreements not related to due process divided by number of mediations held times 100.</p>
--

**Measurable and Rigorous Target:**


The percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements is a performance indicator. Therefore, each state was allowed by OSEP to set its own target from baseline data. The SEA, with input from stakeholder groups, revised the target in FFY 2007 (2007-2008) to reflect a range, and OSEP accepted the target.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009 (2009-2010)	75% - 85% of mediations held will reach an agreement.

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

Figure B19.1 shows the State Education Agency's (SEA) baseline, actual target data, and measurable and rigorous target for each FFY through FFY 2009 (2009-2010), on the percent of mediations held that reached an agreement.





**Figure B19.1. Trend for Percent of Iowa Mediations Held that Resulted in Agreement.** Source. Iowa Department of Education Mediation Data Reports, FFY 2004 (2004-2005) - FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Note: the targets were changed in the FFY 2007 (2007-2008) APR submitted to OSEP. The actual target range is 75%-85%; however, for graphing purposes the lower threshold was selected for display.

As illustrated in Figure B19.1, the state measurable and rigorous target of 75.00% - 85.00% was met for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Table B.19.1 summarizes the total number of mediation requests made, the number held, and the number of agreements reached between July 1, 2009, and June 30, 2010. Data for Indicator 19 are reflected in Section B of 618 Table 7. The data in Table 7 match the data in this report, and the SEA is not required to explain any discrepancies in the data.

**Table B19.1**  
**Mediations and Agreements Reached, FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

<b>Due Process Description</b>	<b>Number Reported (2009-2010)</b>
(2) Mediation Requests Received	31
(2.1) Mediations Held	21
(2.1a) Mediations Held Related to Due Process Complaints (i) Mediation Agreements Related to Due Process Complaints (4)	7
(2.1b) Mediations Held Not Related to Due Process Complaints (i) Mediation Agreements Not Related to Due Process Complaints (12)	14
(2.2) Mediations Not Held (Including Pending)	1
Measurement = Percent = $\frac{[(2.1(a) (i) + 2.1(b)(i)) \text{ divided by } (2.1)] \text{ times } 100.}{((4+12)/21)*100}$	76.19%

*Source. Iowa Department of Education Preappeal and Mediation Reports, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).*

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

Discussion of Improvement Activities That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Meeting targets for each indicator in the SPP is a priority for Iowa, and resources have been committed to each indicator and across indicators, to impact actual target data for each FFY on which performance is reported.

Improvement activities, Measureable Outcomes, and Status/Next Steps are summarized in Table B19.2.

**Table B19.2**  
**Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

<b>Improvement Activity</b>	<b>Measurable Outcomes</b>	<b>Status/Next Steps</b>
<b>Evaluation.</b> The SEA analyzed data collected through a survey of preappeal and mediation participants to determine the effectiveness of the process.	The SEA and mediators identified concerns within the preappeal and mediation process which led to either adjusting preappeal and mediation procedures or continuing with procedures deemed effective.	Ongoing FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and continuing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Evaluation.</b> The SEA analyzed data collected through a three month follow-up survey of preappeal and mediation parents, AEAs and LEAs to determine whether the written agreements were being implemented.	The SEA identified concerns within the written agreement implementation process which led to adjusting preappeal and mediation practices or continuing with procedures deemed effective.	Ongoing FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and continuing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Provide training/professional development.</b> The SEA provided quarterly inservices to all mediators and administrative law judges on State policies and procedures.	The general supervision system assured that identified noncompliance issues were corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.	Ongoing FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and continuing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Provide training/professional development.</b> The SEA provided Introduction to Mediation and other resolution options training for the new mediators. Slots were extended to AEAs, LEAs, Parent Educator staff, and other parent training centers.	Participants learned how to resolve differences and serve as mediators and resolution facilitators, if applicable.	Ongoing for FFY 2009 (2009-2010) and continuing through FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Clarify/examine/develop policies and procedures.</b> A written, systematic plan of action for training newly contracted mediators was completed.	The newly contracted mediators fully understand SEA expectations for mediations.	Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).
<b>Clarify/examine/develop policies and procedures.</b> A document, <i>A Mediator's Guide to Special Education Preappeal Conferences</i> , was written for the newly contracted and experienced mediators.	The document helps mediators understand the mediation process and ensures consistency in practice.	Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).
<b>Clarify/examine/develop policies and procedures.</b> A document, <i>A Mediator's Guide to Mediation (After a Request for a Hearing)</i> , will be written for the newly contracted and the experienced mediators.	The document helps mediators understand the mediation process and ensures consistency in practice.	Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).
<b>Provide training/professional development.</b> A day-long meeting, <i>Ways to Improve the Preappeal/Mediation Process</i> , was held with various persons (including parents) involved in the preappeal and mediation process.	Recommendations were received on ways to improve the mediation process and confirmation was received on the elements that need to be retained.	Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).
<b>Provide training/professional development.</b> A plan was developed to increase the number of people receiving conflict resolution training.	The number of people completing the conflict resolution trainings has increased.	Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

*Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).* The analyses of data form the basis of discussion that follows. Iowa met the State target of 75% - 85% for percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements in FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Results of data indicated the SEA showed progress from FFY 2008 (2008-2009) [75.00%].

The SEA attributes the progress that occurred from FFY 2008 (2008-2009) to FFY 2009 (2009-2010) in large part to the small number of cases. Small cell sizes make the percentages highly variable for this indicator. While Iowa SEA staff pay close attention to any drop in the number or percent of mediations resulting in agreement, it is difficult to attribute a difference of one or two cases to a systemic change. All monitoring and improvement activities in which Iowa staff have engaged during the past fiscal year indicate that the slippage reported here is the result of variation in an indicator on which we report a very small cell size and is not a systemic issue.

Iowa attributes continued performance on this indicator to the training mediators have received and the collaborative nature that exists within our educational system. As stated in earlier indicators, Iowa attributes maintenance in part to: (a) Iowa's commitment to resolving conflicts as early as possible before a situation escalates into a formal dispute, (b) technical assistance received from CADRE regarding dispute prevention and effective resolution strategies, and (c) strong collaboration with Iowa's Parent-Educator Connection (PEC) which provide families of children and youth with disabilities with information and resources that enable effective conflict resolution with schools and AEAs.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2010 (2010-2011):**

No revisions are proposed for FFY 2010 (2010-2011).

**Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

The Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) was developed by Iowa Department of Education (SEA) staff reviewing baseline data, targets and improvement activities and drafting a report for each indicator. Once draft indicator reports were written, stakeholder groups provided input regarding these three components, and comments were compiled. Stakeholder groups included the state Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Area Education Agency (AEA) administration and liaisons, and SEA staff.

Stakeholder groups with representatives of individuals with disabilities, parents, educators, administrators, private adult providers, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation Services, Department of Human Services, and higher education met to review the data, set priorities, and suggest improvement activities. Additional input was sought from stakeholder groups including the State of Iowa Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP), Area Education Agency (AEA) administration, and staff of the State Education Agency (SEA).

In this APR, Iowa will (a) demonstrate compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b), (b) report on the timely and accurate submission of FFY 2009 (2009-2010) data, and (c) use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.

The SEA will report to the public progress/and or slippage in meeting the “measurable and rigorous targets” found in the SPP/APR by posting on the State of Iowa Department of Education website ([http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=category&sectionid=22&id=552&Itemid=592)) sometime after Feb 1, 2011 but no later than April 1, 2011, the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) APR submitted to OSEP. Any changes to the SPP accepted by OSEP will be posted within 30 days of receipt of the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) response letter to Iowa expected for receipt prior to July 1, 2011.

Performance of AEAs and LEAs on appropriate indicators will be posted by June 1, 2011. AEA profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=599&Itemid=1590). District profiles are posted at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=600&Itemid=1591). Iowa’s Accountability Workbook is available at:

[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=655&Itemid=1308).

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B Timely and Accurate**

**Indicator 20:** State-reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

The following measurement for this indicator was a requirement of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) for both the six-year State Performance Plan and each Annual Performance Report.

**Measurement:**

State reported data, including 618 data, State Performance Plan, and Annual Performance Reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel and dispute resolution; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports and assessment); and
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.

The provision of timely and accurate data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) is a compliance indicator and OSEP designated the measurable and rigorous target at 100%. Each annual target of the six year State Performance Plan is set at 100%.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2009</b> (2009-2010)	<b>State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate 100% of the time.</b>

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

In the FFY 2009 (2009-2010), the SEA monitored the timeliness and accuracy of data collected and analyzed for 618 Data Tables, FFY 2009 (2009-2010) State Performance Plan and the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) Annual Performance Report through ongoing verification and validation reports as provided by Iowa's Information Management System (IMS). The SEA and AEA personnel conducted desk audits and selected onsite reviews of needed data. Table B20.1 summarizes timely and accurate data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

Table B20.1  
SEA Type and Number of Reports Submitted to OSEP for Timely and Accurate Data,  
FFY 2009 (2009-2010)

SPP/APR Data - Indicator 20			
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Correct Calculation	Total
1	1		1
2	1		1
3A	1	1	2
3B	1	1	2
3C	1	1	2
4A	1	1	2
4B	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8	1	1	2
9	1	1	2
10	N/A	N/A	0
11	1	1	2
12	1	1	2
13	1	1	2
14	1	1	2
15	1	1	2
16	1	1	2
17	1	1	2
18	1	1	2
19	1	1	2
		<b>Subtotal</b>	38
<b>APR Score Calculation</b>	<b>Timely Submission Points</b> - If the FFY 2009 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.		5
	<b>Grand Total</b> - (Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =		43.00


618 Data - Indicator 20					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Table 1 - Child Count Due Date: 2/1/10	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 - Personnel Due Date: 11/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 3 - Ed. Environments Due Date: 2/1/10	1	1	1	1	4
Table 4 - Exiting Due Date: 11/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 5 - Discipline Due Date: 11/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 6 - State Assessment Due Date: 2/1/11	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
Table 7 - Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
				<b>Subtotal</b>	21
<b>618 Score Calculation</b>			<b>Grand Total</b> (Subtotal X 2.143) =		45.00

Indicator #20 Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	43.00
B. 618 Grand Total	45.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	88.00
Total N/A in APR	2
Total N/A in 618	0
<b>Base</b>	<b>88.00</b>
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*) =	1.000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.00

Source. 618 Data Tables, State Performance Plan and Part B Grant Application for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).



Figure B20.1 shows the target was met for FFY 2009 (2009-2010). Results of state data indicated the target was met with 100% provision of timely and accurate data for 618 Tables, the State Performance Plan, and the Annual Performance Report.



**Figure B20.1. SEA Percent for Submitting Timely and Accurate Data for Required OSEP Reports.** Source. 618 Data Tables, State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Reports, FFY 2009 (2009-2010).

As depicted in Table B20.1 and in Figure B20.1, for FFY 2009 (2009-2010), Iowa met the measureable and rigorous target for Indicator 20, with 100% of required reports filed with OSEP in a timely manner and with accurate data.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):**

*Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed in FFY 2009 (2009-2010).* Meeting targets for each indicator in the SPP is a priority for Iowa, and resources have been committed to each indicator and across indicators, to impact actual target data for each FFY on which performance is reported.

Consistent with activities documented in the SPP, several improvement activities were implemented to impact meeting the targets for this indicator. Improvement activities, Measureable Outcomes, and Status/Next Steps are summarized in Table B20.2.

**Table B20.2**  
**Improvement Activities Completed for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**

Improvement Activity	Measureable Outcomes	Status/Next Steps
<p><b>Improve data collection.</b> The SEA implements a 4-step data verification process for data entry.</p> <p><b>Step 1.</b> AEA IMS data entry personnel are trained to review IEPs for completeness and consistency. If needed, IEP team members are contacted for specific data or the IEP is returned for corrections.</p> <p><b>Step 2.</b> The data entry system has built in checks for duplicate data or for correcting required fields being left blank</p> <p><b>Step 3.</b> AEAs received verification reports on data. The Verification Report is monitored by the SEA to ensure that AEAs regularly access and review potential errors during the two critical seasons for data entry (count/setting and exit).</p> <p><b>Step 4.</b> SEA data personnel periodically review IMS, personnel, and discipline data and contact IMS and AEA staff with specific accuracy issues above and beyond the Verification Report to rectify any data abnormalities.</p>	IMS data are accurate.	Ongoing through FFY 2012 (2012-2013)
<b>Improve data collection.</b> Indicator leads and data analysts met 1-3 times over the course of the FFY to ensure data were accurate.	Accurate data for analysis for all Indicators.	Ongoing through FFY 2012 (2012-2013)
<b>Improve data collection.</b> Data were sent to AEAs for verification and correction for Indicators B4, B7, B11 and B12.	Accurate data for analysis for all Indicators	Ongoing through FFY 2012 (2012-2013)
<b>Improve data collection.</b> OSEP analysis/next steps, measurement table, and APR checklist were used to write APR reports.	Required data elements included for each Indicator.	Ongoing through FFY 2012 (2012-2013)
<b>Improve data collection.</b> OSEP tables were checked against APR and State Report Card data, where applicable, for accuracy.	No Indicator using 618, State Report Card or other required data table (Indicators 16-19) had a measurement variance requiring explanation.	Ongoing through FFY 2012 (2012-2013)
<b>Clarify/examine/develop policies and procedures.</b> The SEA reviewed data collection policies, procedures, and practices for Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 20.	Data definitions are consistent with OSEP's definitions. Data in IMS, EASIER and ISTAR are collected and entered consistent with Indicator definitions.	Ongoing through FFY 2012 (2012-2013)
<b>Provide technical Assistance.</b> The IMS works with AEA data entry staff to ensure consistent and accurate data entry.	Data generated from IMS are accurate	Ongoing through FFY 2012 (2012-2013)

Improvement Activity	Measureable Outcomes	Status/Next Steps
<b>Clarify/examine/develop policies and procedures.</b> The SEA will review all indicators and 618 data elements to ensure that measurement is aligned with OSEP reporting requirements.	All measurements align with reporting requirements.	Completed July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2011
<b>Improve data collection.</b> The SEA will develop a plan for implementing an audit of special education data systems.	The SEA data consultant has worked with a national group on data quality for IDEA. An audit plan is an anticipated outcome of the work for Iowa.	Ongoing for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Provide technical Assistance.</b> The SEA will develop specific verification and validation reports for Indicator 12 data.	Data for Indicator 12 have increased above 99%.	Ongoing for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Clarify/examine/develop policies and procedures.</b> The SEA will clarify procedures around Indicator B7.	The SEA continues to clarify procedures to make ECO data more valid and reliable.	Ongoing for FFY 2010 (2010-2011)
<b>Clarify/examine/develop policies and procedures.</b> The SEA will develop policies and procedures for the continuing identification of children and students with IEPs using the seven new race and ethnicity codes.	Race and ethnicity data based on the new codes are valid and reliable.	Completed July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2011

*Explanation of Progress or Slippage That Occurred for FFY 2009 (2009-2010).* The analyses of data form the basis of discussion that follows. Iowa met the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) measurable and rigorous target for timely and accurate data, with 100% of reports submitted being timely and accurate. This represents no change from FFY 2008 (2008-2009).

The SEA attributes this improvement to (a) continued efforts by SEA personnel to submit accurate 618 and SPP/APR data on time and accurately, (b) efforts by SEA personnel to coordinate 618 data submissions with Iowa's EdFacts coordinator, (c) continued efforts by SEA, AEA, and LEA personnel to verify and validate data.

Per OSEP requirements set forth in the December 13, 2008 SPP/APR TA conference call, states must answer the following questions relating to the timely correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (2009-2010):

1. What analysis was conducted to determine where noncompliance was occurring?
  2. Why was noncompliance occurring?
  3. What changes in policies, procedures and practices were determined necessary?
  4. How does the state know that timely correction occurred?
  5. If timely correction did not occur, what enforcement actions were taken by the state?
1. The SEA determines if noncompliance is occurring with respect to Indicator 20 by examining each data submission from LEAs and AEAs for accuracy and timeliness.
  2. No noncompliance was determined to be occurring for FFY 2009 (2009 – 2010).
  3. The SEA knows that timely correction of noncompliance has occurred when data is received back from AEAs or LEAs and the data files are corrected for missing data or outliers, and when the percent of data submitted timely and accurate reaches 100%. The SEA also verifies that in each program for which noncompliance is identified, the specific regulatory requirements are being correctly implemented by ensuring that AEA and LEAs adopt and are trained in statewide procedures for the development and implementation of IEPs that are aligned with Iowa's Special Education Rules, Iowa Code, and Federal Code.
  4. While not required to be exercised for FFY 2009 (2009-2010), the SEA determines any LEA or AEA not submitting 100% of data on time and accurately to be in need of assistance in implementing the IDEA, and also requires the LEA or AEA to write a corrective action plan if the problem persists for more than one year.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines /  
Resources for FFY 2010 (2010-2011):**

No revisions are proposed for FFY 2010 (2010-2011).